

JUL 24 1944

AMERICAN MUSEUM  
OF NATURAL HISTORY  
NEW YORK

# MID-AMERICA

## *An Historical Review*

JULY 1944

VOLUME 20

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 15

NUMBER 3

---

### CONTENTS

#### THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE JESUITS TO THE EXPLORATION AND ANTHROPOLOGY OF SOUTH AMERICA

*Alfred Métraux*

#### EL RIO DEL ESPIRITU SANTO

*Jean Delanghe*

#### DOCUMENT: THE VOYAGE OF LOUIS JOLLIET TO HUDSON BAY IN 1679

*Jean Delanghe*

#### BOOK REVIEWS

SAYE, *New Viewpoints in Georgia History; NEWAT, East Florida as a British Province 1763-1784.*

---

PUBLISHED BY LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY  
CHICAGO 28, ILLINOIS



# MID-AMERICA

*An Historical Review*

VOLUME 26, NUMBER 3

JULY 1944

# MID-AMERICA

*An Historical Review*

JULY 1944

VOLUME 26

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 15

NUMBER 3

---

## CONTENTS

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE JESUITS TO THE EXPLORATION AND ANTHROPOLOGY OF SOUTH AMERICA . . . . .	<i>Alfred Métraux</i>	183
EL RIO DEL ESPIRITU SANTO . . . . .	<i>Jean Delanglez</i>	192
DOCUMENT: THE VOYAGE OF LOUIS JOLLIET TO HUDSON BAY IN 1679 . . . . .	<i>Jean Delanglez</i>	221
BOOK REVIEWS . . . . .		251
<i>SAYE, New Viewpoints in Georgia History; MOWAT, East Florida     as a British Province 1763-1784.</i>		

---

### MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

### EDITORIAL STAFF

WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL  
J. MANUEL ESPINOSA  
W. EUGENE SHIELS

RAPHAEL HAMILTON  
PAUL KINIERY  
JEAN DELANGLEZ

---

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History)  
at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, \$2.00; in foreign countries, \$2.50.  
Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road,  
Chicago 26, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing  
Editor. Entered as second class matter August 7, 1929, at the post office at  
Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Printed in the United States.



# MID-AMERICA

*An Historical Review*

JULY 1944

VOLUME 26

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 15

NUMBER 3

## The Contribution of the Jesuits to the Exploration and Anthropology of South America

The year 1767 is one of the most fateful in the history of Latin America. For thousands of Indians it spelled misery or death and for human knowledge it ushered in a period of darkness which lasted almost one hundred years. In 1767 the Jesuits were expelled from America, their missions destroyed, and their scientific activities brusquely interrupted.

The disaster which befell the Order affected anthropology as well. Only at the end of the nineteenth century do works again appear which may be compared in value with the descriptions of native customs and institutions written by the Jesuits during the two hundred years of their spiritual conquest of the continent. Had it not been for the intelligent curiosity and scientific spirit of so many Jesuit missionaries, our knowledge of the South American Indian would have been meager and sketchy indeed.

So considerable is their contribution to the anthropology of South America that it would be impossible even to list within the framework of a brief paper all the Jesuit sources used by the modern anthropologists to reconstruct the Indian past. The achievements of the Jesuits can best be illustrated by citing some outstanding writers in a single area, like the Gran Chaco.

The Chaco is a forbidding plain which stretches across the center of the South American continent from the Andes to the Paraguay and Paraná rivers and which forms a transition area between the Pampas and the tropical forest. It was inhabited, and still is in part, by half-nomadic, warlike tribes who fiercely

EDITOR'S NOTE: This paper was read at the Fifty-eighth Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association in New York, December 30, 1943.

resisted the inroads of white colonization and who, after acquiring the horse, became a serious threat to the Spanish and Portuguese settlements in Paraguay, the Argentine, and Mato Grosso. At the price of great sufferings the first conquistadors of the La Plata basin succeeded in crossing these dry deserts and in reaching the Andes, but until the nineteenth century efforts to found towns in the Chaco or even to subjugate its inhabitants failed completely.

Yet, the most formidable Indian tribes in the Chaco—the Abipon, the Mocovi, and the Mbaya—were partly won over by missionaries of the Company of Jesus without resort to political or military pressure. The efforts made by the Jesuits to pacify these Indians, who had terrorized the Spanish towns and settlements, were prompted by Christian zeal, but also perhaps to demonstrate their usefulness to the Spanish empire. Moreover, they hoped to establish through the Chaco direct links between the flourishing missions of Paraguay and those of eastern Bolivia.

The Jesuits probably would have extended their rule throughout the Chaco if the Order had not been expelled. When they left, the regions pacified by them were partly lost to the white man and some areas remained *terra incognita* down to the present.

The anthropology of the Chaco was enriched by five great Jesuit books: *Historia de Abiponibus, equestri, bellicosaque Paraquariae natione* by Martin Dobrizhoffer;<sup>1</sup> *El Paraguay católico* by José Sánchez Labrador;<sup>2</sup> *Hin und her* by Florián Baucke;<sup>3</sup> *Descripción corográfica del Gran Chaco Gualamba* by Pedro Lozano;<sup>4</sup> and finally *Saggio sulla storia naturale della provincia del Gran Chaco* by José Jolis.<sup>5</sup> Other accounts of the same period also by Jesuits could be cited. From our modern point of view these five are outstanding sources of information.

The best known, of course, is the *Historia de Abiponibus* by

<sup>1</sup> Martin Dobrizhoffer (1717-1791), *Historia de Abiponibus, equestri, bellicosaque Paraquariae natione*, . . . 3 volumes, Vienna, 1784. German translation, 3 volumes, Vienna, 1783-1784; English translation, 3 volumes, London, 1822.

<sup>2</sup> José Sánchez Labrador (1717-1799), *El Paraguay católico*, 4 volumes, Buenos Aires, 1910-1936. (Unpublished previously.)

<sup>3</sup> Florián Baucke (1719-1780), *Hin und her* . . . Several abridged editions have appeared since the early nineteenth century, the most important being that of Andrés Kobler, *Pater Florián Baucke, ein Jesuit in Paraguay (1748-1766)*, Regensburg, New York, Cincinnati, 1870.

<sup>4</sup> Pedro Lozano (1697-1759), *Descripción corográfica del Gran Chaco Gualamba*, Instituto de Antropología, Tucumán, 1941.

<sup>5</sup> José Jolis, *Saggio sulla storia naturale della provincia del Gran Chaco*, Faenza, 1789.

Dobrizhoffer, which, soon after its publication in 1784, was translated into German and English. During the whole nineteenth century it was one of the most often quoted sources in the field of the new science of anthropology and sociology. Furthermore it remains one of the few excellent monographs on any South American tribe. The author, an Austrian father, spent seven years among the wild Abipon of the Gran Chaco. Upon his return to Austria, to quote the poet Southey

So he the years of his old age employed  
A faithful chronicler in handing down  
Names which he loved, and things well worthy to be known.<sup>6</sup>

His descriptions roused great interest in a public that was newly aware of and curious about the "noble savage."

After giving us a fairly accurate picture of the geographical milieu and a good account of the historical background of the missions, Dobrizhoffer proceeds to speak of the Abipon much as any ethnographer might do today. His statements on the material culture and economic life of his Indians are precise and fairly complete. They have been amply verified by observations made among modern Indians of the Chaco. His account becomes invaluable when he deals with religion and social institutions. For no modern tribe of the Chaco have we such a wealth of detail on ceremonies, etiquette, and beliefs. He devotes many pages to descriptions of social groups, such as military societies, which today have vanished. He is one of the first to have observed that Indian chieftainship was based mainly on continual acts of generosity. Modern anthropology has grown increasingly interested in social psychology and in collective neuroses. On these subjects little is to be found in the literature, and therefore it is a real surprise to discover that Dobrizhoffer describes at length a special type of insanity which assumed epidemic proportions.

As he had mastered the Abipon language, he used the modern procedure of quoting both the native terms for objects and institutions and whole sentences which directly express the feelings and the ideas of his informants. Here are, for instance, the reactions of the people to an irate shaman who threatens to turn into a jaguar: "Look! Alas, his whole body is beginning to be covered with jaguar spots. Look! his nails are growing." When asked by Dobrizhoffer why they did not fear real jaguars but only imaginary ones, they gave him this revealing answer: "We

<sup>6</sup> Robert Southey, *A Tale of Paraguay*, London, 1826, Canto II.

never fear, but kill all jaguars in the plain, because we can see them. Supernatural jaguars, we do fear, because they can neither be seen nor killed by us." The French sociologist, Levy-Bruhl, in his famous work on *Primitive Mentality*, has used that sentence to illustrate the difference between the logic and the mystic aspects of primitive thought. Many other anecdotes told by Dobrizhoffer evoke Abipon life in all its color and complexity.

Less well known but of equal scientific value is Sánchez Labrador's monumental work, *El Paraguay natural ilustrado* and *El Paraguay católico*. The first part is still unpublished and, according to Father Furlong, would fill about forty volumes. Of the second series of his Paraguayan and Chaco studies four volumes have appeared. Two deal with the ethnography of the Mbayá and with a geographical and botanical description of their milieu. A third volume contains his grammar and dictionary of the Mbayá language. The fourth volume deals with the ethnography and geography of the Province of Buenos Aires and of Patagonia.

Sánchez Labrador, who spent thirty-three years in South America, devoted seven of them to the conversion of the most bellicose Chaco tribe, the Mbayá. In 1766 he discovered a direct way from his mission of Belén in Paraguay to the Mission of San Ignacio in Chiquitos, thus fulfilling the long cherished project of the Jesuits of uniting their missions of Bolivia with those of Paraguay.

This apostle to the Mbayá, this explorer of the Chaco boreal, was at heart a naturalist. But unlike the great scientist of the nineteenth century whose interest in the Indian always remained superficial, Sánchez Labrador was as exact and minute in his descriptions of Indian techniques and ceremonies as in his classifications of plants. His anthropological papers lack perhaps the gusto and picturesqueness of Dobrizhoffer's account, but they are not less abundant in details and relevant facts. Among other items he gives us an unequaled picture of the strongly stratified Mbayá society, of its haughty aristocrats, its warriors, its serfs and slaves. Just as the publication in 1910 of his manuscripts clarified the confused classification of Indian tribes in the northern Chaco, no doubt his papers on the Guaraní will provide new data on this celebrated but little known tribe.

The work of Florián Baucke also will be entirely appreciated only when its complete manuscript has been published. Though an abridged edition had already been published in 1870, the first

part of the Spanish translation of the original manuscript appeared only last year. Baucke lacked somewhat the anthropological curiosity which characterized his two colleagues, and his bulky work, entitled *Hin und her*, is more of a diary with all kinds of digressions than a systematic account of Indian life. Nonetheless, it is a rich mine for the anthropologist, the more so since Baucke, who was not a great artist, endeavored to draw the types and the scenes he had under his eyes. These pictures, reproduced by Father Furlong in a special album,<sup>7</sup> are invaluable for the student, who thus is made acquainted with many aspects of the material culture of the now extinct or almost extinct Mocovi Indians. The homely touch and the profuse details which fill this work clearly evoke life in a Jesuit mission with all its miseries, its struggles, and its simple greatness. Those interested in the "psychology of conversion" may be referred to the conversations and the case histories included by Baucke in his notes.

Lozano was another type of Jesuit scholar. His classic, *Descripción corográfica del Gran Chaco Gualamba*, is a compilation of documents rather than an original work, yet it is equally precious since it gives information on tribes otherwise unknown.

Mention must also be made of Jolis, *Saggio sulla storia naturale*, of which only the first volume has been published. This Jesuit, who lived among the little known tribes of the western Chaco, was a scientist of rare distinction. The data on the Indians scattered throughout this first volume make one regret doubly the loss of the rest of his work which was dedicated to the ethnography of the Chaco.

Father Guillermo Furlong-Cardiff, also a Jesuit, has published in recent years a series of monographs dedicated to the history of the Jesuit missions among Chaco tribes. These contain many documents of great interest to the scholar on the vanished peoples of the Argentine Chaco.

The anthropologist feels a debt of gratitude to the numerous Jesuit fathers who wrote the *Annuae litterae*, which later were utilized by such great historians as Du Toit, Lozano, Charlevoix, Ovalle, Vasconcellos, and others.

The upper reaches of the Amazon were, and in part still are, occupied by hundreds of small tribes, belonging to a very large number of linguistic stocks. Their classification would have been impossible had it not been for the Jesuit writers. Although a few

<sup>7</sup> Guillermo Furlong, ed., *Florián Baucke: iconografía colonial rioplatense, 1749-1767, costumbres y trajes de españoles, criollos e indios*, Buenos Aires, 1935.



modern anthropologists have made worth-while contributions to the ethnography of that area, the bulk of our knowledge even now rests on the works of such authors as Francisco Figueroa,<sup>8</sup> José Chantre y Herrera,<sup>9</sup> Franz Xavier Veigl,<sup>10</sup> Father Samuel Fritz,<sup>11</sup> and on the documents gathered by Father Maroni and published by Jiménez de la Espada under the title *Noticias auténticas del famoso río Marañón*.<sup>12</sup>

Likewise our main sources of information on the ethnography of the plains and forested area of eastern Bolivia are the letters and reports of the Jesuit missionaries to their Superiors and reprinted in various South American collections and journals.<sup>13</sup> The Mojo, who today are completely assimilated to the Creole population, represented a strange civilization combining old Amazonian elements with strong influences from the Andes. They enjoyed considerable prestige in Pre-Hispanic America and the legends around the "Gran Mojo" enticed the Spaniards into several disastrous adventures.

Whatever is known about the ethnology of the ancient Mojo is due entirely to Jesuit fathers like Marbán, José Castillo, Altamirano, and especially Francisco Xavier Eder's, *Descriptio Provinciae Mojitarum*. Actually Eder describes the Christianized Mojo, but he was still able to observe a great many of their ancient customs and his accounts of their economic activities and of their feasts are invaluable.

Likewise Brother Lucas Caballero left a short treatise on the religion of the Manasi, a tribe now extinct, whom he discovered in the very center of the continent in 1706.<sup>14</sup> His is the only de-

<sup>8</sup> Francisco Figueroa, *Relación de las misiones de la Compañía de Jesús en el país de los Maynas*, Madrid, 1904.

<sup>9</sup> José Chantre y Herrera (1738-1801), *Historia de las misiones de la Compañía de Jesús en el Marañón español (1637-1767)*, Madrid, 1901.

<sup>10</sup> Franz Xavier Veigl (1723-1798), *Gründliche Nachrichten über die Verfassung der Landschaft von Maynas in Süd-Amerika, bis zum Jahre 1768*, Nurnberg, 1785.

<sup>11</sup> Samuel Fritz (1656-c. 1728-1730), *Journal of the travels and labours of . . . in the River of the Amazons between 1686 and 1733*, The Hakluyt Society, second series, no. 51, London, 1922.

<sup>12</sup> Paul Maroni, *Noticias auténticas del famoso río Marañón y misión apostólica de la Compañía de Jesús de la Provincia de Quito en los dilatados bosques de dicho río*. Written in 1737 and published in *Boletín de la Sociedad geográfica de Madrid*, Vols. 26-33, 1889-1892.

<sup>13</sup> For the bibliography of the Jesuit literature on eastern Bolivia, see A. Métraux, *The Native Tribes of Eastern Bolivia and Western Matto Grosso*, Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bul. 134, Washington, 1942, and "The Social Organization and Religion of the Mojo and Manasi," *Primitive Man*, Vol. 16, nos. 1-2, 1943.

<sup>14</sup> Hermano Lucas Caballero, *Relación de las costumbres y religión de los indios manasicas*. Estudio preliminar y edición del ms. de 1706 por Manuel Serrano y Sanz, Madrid, n. d.

tailed ethnographic study of any of the Chiquito groups, a powerful nation which extended from the Andes to the Paraguay River. Caballero's monograph reveals a religious system which blends in a well-organized cult of old Amazonian shamanism with a pantheon of gods of Peruvian origin.

Such anthropological classics as the works of Joseph Gumilla,<sup>15</sup> Gilij,<sup>16</sup> Juan Rivero,<sup>17</sup> Fernão Cardim,<sup>18</sup> Falkner,<sup>19</sup> to quote at random, have all been written by members of the Company.

Whoever has handled the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century sources on South America cannot avoid being struck by the literary qualities which characterize Jesuit documents. Most of them are written in a clear and elegant language and they rarely suffer from the stylistic obscurities which so often mar other accounts.

The Jesuits also laid the foundation of linguistic studies in South America. Thanks to them, countless languages now extinct were recorded and saved from oblivion. The rules of the Company made it compulsory for each missionary to speak the language of the people among whom he lived. The grammar of the Tupi language which Father Anchieta wrote in 1556, at once became a powerful instrument in the conversion of the Brazilian Indians.<sup>20</sup> During the same year a course in Tupi language was inaugurated at the Jesuit college of Bahia. So great was the importance attached by the Company to the knowledge of native languages that its students in Brazil who were weak in Latin could redeem themselves at the examination if they had a good command of Tupi. A missionary had to learn the vernacular and write a glossary, and if possible a grammar, as a preliminary step toward the evangelization of a new group of Indians. Although their grammars were patterned of course after the rules of Latin

<sup>15</sup> Joseph Gumilla (c. 1690-1750), *El Orinoco defendido y ilustrado*, Barcelona, 1791.

<sup>16</sup> Phil. Salv. Gilij (1721-1789), *Saggio di Storia americana*, Roma, 1780-1784.

<sup>17</sup> Juan Rivero (c. 1681-1685-1736), *Historia de las misiones de los llanos de Casanare y los rios Orinoco y Meta* (written in 1736), Bogotá, 1883.

<sup>18</sup> Fernão Cardim (1548-1625), *Tratados da terra e gente do Brasil* (written in the sixteenth century), Rio de Janeiro, 1925, 2d ed., Rio de Janeiro, 1939.

<sup>19</sup> Thomas Falkner (1707-1784), *Description of Patagonia*, London, 1774.

<sup>20</sup> José de Anchieta (1534-1597). First published in Coimbra, 1595, under the title *Arte de grammatica da lingua mais usada na costa do Brasil*. Many subsequent editions. Facsimile edition by Julius Platzmann, Leipzig, 1874.



speech, the Jesuits took a great interest in these barbaric tongues and were the first to realize their intricacies and difficult phonetics. Again, a simple enumeration of the linguistic works of the Company would be beyond the scope of this paper and it must suffice to mention here Montoya's monumental Guaraní dictionary and grammar,<sup>21</sup> Bertonio's Aymara dictionary,<sup>22</sup> and Valdivia's works on Araucanian.<sup>23</sup> Some of these linguistic works are still used by scholars, since no better ones have taken their place.

The linguistic labors of the Jesuits culminated in Hervás' great survey of the languages of the world.<sup>24</sup> His was the first attempt to list all the native languages of the Americas and to classify them according to their relationships. Hervás used mainly the information furnished by the expelled missionaries. Many linguistic families have remained as Hervás established them and for scores of languages we are still dependent on his evidence. That such work was possible at the end of the eighteenth century is due entirely to the scientific ingenuity of the Jesuits.

The abundance of maps prepared by the Jesuits demonstrate their keen interest in geography. The University of La Plata published a few years ago a *Cartografía jesuítica*<sup>25</sup> of the region of the La Plata basin which contains fifty-one maps. Some are remarkably exact and for various areas have hardly been modified in recent years.

As in North America, the Jesuits of South America were great explorers, but it would be impossible here to follow them in all their trips and discoveries. In 1593 several Jesuits, among them Father Barzana, crossed the southern Chaco, a deed which was only repeated by military expedition about two hundred years later. In 1641 Father Acuña accompanied the Texeira expedition down the Amazon and gave us the first scientific descrip-

<sup>21</sup> Antonio Ruiz de Montoya (1593-1652), *Arte, Vocabulario, Tesoro y Catecismo de la lengua Guaraní*, Madrid, 1639. Facsimile edition by Julius Platzmann, Leipzig, 1876.

<sup>22</sup> Louis Bertonio (1555-1628), *Arte y gramática muy copiosa de la lengua Aymara*, Rome, 1603. Several later editions. Facsimile edition by Julius Platzmann, Leipzig, 1879.

<sup>23</sup> Luis de Valdivia (1561-1642), *Catecismo en lengua Allentiaci. Arte y gramática general de la lengua que corre en todo el reyno de Chile*, Lima, 1606. Several later editions. Facsimile edition by Julius Platzmann, Leipzig, 1887.

<sup>24</sup> Lorenzo Hervás Panduro (1735-1809). For listings of Hervás' extensive, well-known pioneer linguistic studies, cf. Carlos Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 11 volumes, Bruxelles-Paris, 1890-1932, IV, 318-325.

<sup>25</sup> Guillermo Furlong, *Cartografía jesuítica del Río de la Plata*, 2 volumes, Buenos Aires, 1936.

tion of the geography of the great Brazilian artery. In 1654 Father Raymundo de Santa Cruz in ascending the Napo found a short route from the missions of the Huallaga to Quito and perished on one of his expeditions. Father Fritz, the apostle to the Omaguas, was also an intrepid explorer. His vast knowledge of the geography of the Upper Amazon allowed him to make a map of these regions which became justly famous. The basin of the Mamoré and Guaporé was explored in 1674 by another Jesuit, Father Baraza. From 1701 to 1757 the Jesuits entered the deserts of southern Chiquitos and northern Chaco to collect the Zamuco Indians into missions. They Christianized Indians whose descendants returned to the wilderness, never to be seen after the padres left.

Few explorers of the nineteenth century ever faced the hardships encountered by the Jesuit pioneers who abandoned themselves to the current of uncharted rivers "*ad majorem Dei gloriam*." Their accounts speak again and again of the same miseries: hunger, mosquitos, malaria, dysentery, and often hostile natives. Many perished in these adventures, others returned with maps showing new rivers, new lands, and new people. Isolation in the jungle and constant struggles with rough nature and men often lower the white man's morale and sap his energy. Yet, how alert, how keenly interested in the surrounding world the Jesuits remained after years of lonely hardship! Descriptions of their adventures and of conditions faced in the outposts of their mission empire cause one to wonder how they found time for anthropological, linguistic, and geographical pursuits.

The anthropologist is not the only one who can profit by reading the works of the Jesuits. A time will surely come when historians will be more interested than they seem to be now in reconstructing colonial life in South America, a faithful image of which they will find in such works as those described. Those who know the interior of South America will be surprised to discover how few changes have occurred in three hundred years.

South American ethnography and geography are still fields partly unexplored. May the investigators of our time show as great intelligence, culture, energy, and enthusiasm as their precursors of the Company of Jesus.

ALFRED MÉTRAUX

Bureau of American Ethnology,  
Smithsonian Institution

# El Rio Del Espiritu Santo

(Concluded)

## VIII

If there is any country where the name of the greatest of all rivers which empty into the Gulf of Mexico should have been known, that country is Spain. Spaniards had explored the Gulf more than a century and a half before La Salle reached the mouth of the Mississippi in 1682, and after 1686, when they named the Mississippi, they continued their search for the Bahía del Espíritu Santo into which, according to their maps, the Rio del Espíritu Santo discharged itself. This latter fact alone disposes of the gratuitous contention that the Mississippi was well known in government circles under the name of Rio del Espíritu Santo. Such an affirmation is certainly not based on cartographical or documentary evidence.

Twenty-five years ago, W. E. Dunn treated in detail of the rediscovery of the Gulf Coast by the Spaniards in a book which is still the only authoritative work on the subject.<sup>1</sup> In following his narrative, we shall call attention to those documents which indicate what knowledge of the geography of the Gulf of Mexico was possessed by the Spaniards in the last years of the seventeenth century.

In the first months of 1684, a Spanish pilot, Martín Echagaray,<sup>2</sup> presented to the King of Spain a memorial in which he proposed means to guard against the French menace in Florida, and offered to explore the coast from Apalache to Tampico. His knowledge of the coast, however, was very vague and was derived partly from a study of antiquated sea charts, partly from what he understood the Indians of Spanish Florida to have told him. From the port of Apalache to Tampico, according to his memorial,

there are 300 leagues [of coast] . . . In this region there are rivers of great volume (muy caudalosos). In particular the Bahía del Espíritu Santo is located there, 220 leagues from Vera Cruz and 140 leagues

<sup>1</sup> W. E. Dunn, *Spanish and French Rivalry in the Gulf Region of the United States, 1678-1702. The Beginnings of Texas and Pensacola*, Austin, Texas, 1917.

<sup>2</sup> On Echagaray, cf. Dunn, *op. cit.*, 20, note 19.

from the port of Apalache [present-day St. Marks, Florida]. Sea charts indicate this bay as being one of the best harbors. I learned from Indians who live on [the shores of] this bay and who are today living in the Apalache mission, that two very great rivers flow into it, one coming from a vast province called *Mouila*, it is not known where this river has its headwaters, but the other river comes from New Mexico.<sup>3</sup>

Like all Spanish pilots, Echagaray's distances are given in Spanish sea leagues, of which there are seventeen and one-half to a degree of latitude, approximately 3.9 miles to a league. By converting into miles the distance from Vera Cruz to the Bahía del Espíritu Santo, we see that the latter would be located on a modern map near the mouth of the Sabine River; and by converting into miles the distance from Apalache to the Bahía del Espíritu Santo, leaving out the delta of which Echagaray had no knowledge, the Bahía del Espíritu Santo would be in the vicinity of Calcasieu Pass, Louisiana. His description of this bay, however, applies to Mobile Bay, for it was from this vicinity that the Indians had come to the Apalache mission, and the two rivers which empty into his Bahía del Espíritu Santo are in fact the Alabama River which comes from the *Mouila* country, and the Tombigbee River, whose lower course comes from the north-northwest, i. e., from the general direction of New Mexico. His identification of our Mobile Bay with the Bahía del Espíritu Santo, although erroneous, is pertinent to the question at issue because, first, Echagaray does not name either of the two rios *muy caudalosos*, although on the map or maps of the Gulf which he had a Rio del Espíritu Santo was shown emptying into this bay; and secondly, if his Bahía del Espíritu Santo is Mobile Bay, it is clear that any river which he describes as emptying into it cannot be the Mississippi.

The main point of Echagaray's proposal with reference to the French menace was to transport to Florida fifty Spanish families from the Canary Islands and twenty-four Indian families from Campeche. The memorial was sent to the Consulado of the Casa de la Contratación, but was set aside as simply a scheme "to sell goods, free of all duties in Florida, Havana, and Campeche." Echagaray's appeal to the Council of the Indies late in 1684 was more favorably received, and his plan was approved by the *fiscal* whose report is dated April 11, 1685. The Junta de

<sup>3</sup> Echagaray Expediente, Archivo General de Indias (AGI), Mexico, 61-6-20. The quotations are from transcripts in the E. E. Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library, Chicago.

Guerra adopted this official's recommendations two months later, and the royal *cédula* in which Echagaray's offer was accepted was promulgated August 2, 1685.<sup>4</sup>

In his letter covering the memorial of 1684, Echagaray had advocated fortifying the Bahía del Espíritu Santo "so as to forbid its entrance to the enemy." Owing to the suspicions of the Consulado and the delay in taking action, the "enemy" had been in the places six months when the pilot's plan finally received the formal royal approval; for, in the preceding February, La Salle had planted his colony at Matagorda Bay. This disturbing news came to the Spaniards at the end of October 1685, through Denis Thomas, a member of La Salle's last expedition, who had deserted at Petit Goave. This Frenchman later embarked on a corsair which had been captured by the Spaniards and taken to Vera Cruz. The destination of the La Salle expedition, said the prisoner, was a place called *Micipipi*. To the Spaniards this name meant nothing at all, and although they surmised that the place referred to was somewhere on the Gulf Coast, four and a half years elapsed before they finally located the ruins of La Salle's settlement on the Garcitas River.

On hearing Thomas' account, Admiral Palacios at once consulted his maps and studied

the unfamiliar region north of the Gulf of Mexico. There was clearly only one river leading from New France to the Gulf, along whose course one could travel for five hundred leagues. This was the river shown on the maps of the time as the "Rio del Espíritu Santo," flowing into the famous bay of the same name. Admiral Palacios . . . was not long in concluding that the probable site of the French settlement was on this river and bay. When he estimated the distance from Espíritu Santo to the various ports of Mexico and Florida, finding that it was only one hundred and twenty leagues from Apalache, one hundred and sixty-five from Vera Cruz, the dangerous proximity of the invaders was immediately realized.<sup>5</sup>

The above is Dunn's résumé of Palacios' letter. We shall quote from the letter itself the prisoners' actual words as recorded by the admiral, in order to ascertain to what events of La Salle's voyages they referred; we shall next distinguish this information from Palacios' conclusions, and finally we shall see whether he identified the river descended by La Salle as the Rio del Espíritu Santo.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Dunn, *op. cit.*, 25-29.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, 38.



The prisoners said "that from New France . . . a Frenchman [La Salle] left with four or five other [Frenchmen] and some Indians and proceeded toward the west through an arm of the sea." The *brazo de mar que corre asia el occidente* is clearly the St. Lawrence River and the event referred to is the beginning of La Salle's explorations. "These men were inhabitants of a place in New France called Canada." The prisoners further said that after several months of navigation on this arm of the sea, La Salle and his men "came upon a very great lake, which they crossed on a ship to the end of it." This is an allusion to the *Griffon*, *la embarcazion*, and to the Great Lakes, *una laguna muy grande*. At the end of this laguna "they found another mouth [of a river] which they entered and after a voyage of more than 500 leagues they came upon a bay and a port at the entrance of which there was a small island dividing the river into two channels, and they descended these channels and reached the sea in the Gulf of Mexico." One readily sees that the expedition to the Gulf, 1681-1682, is made to appear as a continuation of the voyage of the *Griffon* in August-September 1679. The distance of more than five hundred leagues, it should be observed, is that from the *laguna muy grande* to the Gulf, and Palacios, like Echagaray and all other Spanish sailors, counted seventeen and one-half leagues for each degree of latitude. Consequently, since on his map the Bahía del Espíritu Santo was at latitude 30°, the mouth of the river at the end of the *laguna* was situated 1,200 miles north of the actual starting point of La Salle's voyage. The last words of the above quotation give the prisoners' version of the arrival of La Salle's party at the head of the passes of the Mississippi.

The fact that none of these men had been with La Salle, and that they were repeating, and probably further distorting what they had heard on the way from France to Santo Domingo, does not in the least affect the question, because Palacios' knowledge was wholly derived from what they told him, and it is on this knowledge that he calculated the position of the Bahía del Espíritu Santo where he thought La Salle had landed.

"When they were about half a league away from the sea the altitude of the sun was taken, but the prisoners declared that they did not know at what latitude they were; all that they know is that this [place] was called *Bahia de Misipipi*." La Salle then returned to France, where the expedition to the Gulf was organized. At Santo Domingo, on his way back, he bought what was

necessary "to start a settlement *a esta Bahía llamada Misipipi*; this was about nine months ago." Here ends the information supplied by the French prisoners, which Palacios then tried to interpret with the help of a sea chart of the Gulf of Mexico.

Considering the distance of 500 leagues over which they traveled, [the bay called Misipipi] can be none other than that which, on the maps, is called Bahía del Espíritu Santo, which, in the Gulf [of Mexico], lies at about latitude 30°, and is 145 leagues from a port named Tampico; from the said port to Vera Cruz there are 60 leagues, and from the said Bahía del Espíritu Santo to Mexico there are 280 leagues, partly along the coast and the rest overland.<sup>6</sup>

Comparing this direct translation of Palacios' letter with Dunn's résumé of it, we see that the latter inserted the name "Rio del Espíritu Santo" which is not mentioned at all. Palacios' reasoning is that the *bay* which the French called Misipipi can be none other than that which on his map is "la Bahía que llaman del espiritu ss.<sup>to</sup>," situated at latitude 30°. It does not matter that, according to the prisoners, La Salle and his men came down to the bay by way of a river, for the question is, whether Palacios identified this river. Since he did not, we must conclude that the Mississippi was not generally known under the name Rio del Espíritu Santo; otherwise Palacios, an admiral of the Windward Squadron, would surely not have hesitated to make the identification of the river and of the bay.

On October 27, 1685, Palacios wrote to the viceroy apprising him of what he had learned. When the courier reached Mexico City, November 3, an extraordinary council was immediately summoned, and two days later the viceroy issued a decree leaving everything in the hands of Palacios. The speed with which the Spaniards acted is a sufficient indication of their anxiety. Palacios had suggested that the search for La Salle's colony be made from Havana, because he thought the officials of that place were more familiar with the northern Gulf Coast. On November 21, 1685, a ship left Vera Cruz for Havana. On board were two pilots, Juan Enríquez Barroto, "an experienced draughtsman as well as a practical pilot," and Antonio Romero, who "had made many voyages from Havana to Apalache, and was personally

<sup>6</sup> "Segun los maps en la distancia de 500 leguas que andubieron [the Bahía llamada Misipipi] no puede ser otra sino es la Bahía que llaman de espiritu ss.<sup>to</sup> q esta en esta ensenada casi en 30 grados de Altura y dista de Vn puerto llamado Tampico 145 leg<sup>a</sup> y desde el dho Puerto hasta dela Vera cruz 60 leguas y de la dha Bahía del espiritu ss.<sup>to</sup> a Mex<sup>co</sup> ay 280 leguas seguidas parte por costa y los demas p. Tierra adentro," Palacios to —, November 17, 1685, AGI, Mexico, 61-6-20.



familiar with that portion of the route to be followed." These two men had orders from the viceroy to the authorities of Havana commanding them to equip a vessel for the expeditionary voyage.<sup>7</sup>

One month after the arrival of the pilots at Havana the frigate *Nuestra Señora de la Concepción y San Joseph* left the harbor for the north. From Apalachee Bay, they sailed west, stopping at Pensacola Bay and at Mobile Bay. On March 4, 1686, "at eleven o'clock in the morning," wrote Jordán de la Reina<sup>8</sup> in the only extant log of the journey,

I reached the extremity of this shore along which were a number of tiny islands formed of mud flats through which poured a large river; the latter I called Palizada river because of the many stranded trees at its mouth; the water flows very swiftly. This was at latitude 29° 3'.<sup>9</sup>

Dunn who supplemented this account with other documents adds that a prominent landmark in the vicinity of the mouth of the Mississippi was christened Cabo de Lodo and that a storm having arisen, the ship was driven to latitude 22°, whence they sailed to Vera Cruz, arriving there on March 13.<sup>10</sup>

Toward the end of his report Jordán de la Reina wrote as follows:

I hereby state, Sir, that I believe this stream, to which I gave the name Palizada river, is a hundred leagues from the port of Apalachee; furthermore, I am of the opinion that the bay of Espíritu Santo which we were looking for does not lie on the parallel indicated on the charts; I believe that it is farther west, though not very much.<sup>11</sup>

These two passages from Jordán de la Reina's journal clearly show that the Mississippi was not known to the Spaniards as the Rio del Espíritu Santo, otherwise the pilot would not have given it a new name, or at least would have said that this was the famous river which appears on so many maps. As can be seen, he specifically stated that the Bahía del Espíritu Santo into which the river of the same name flowed was farther west. When Barroto, Romero, and Jordán de la Reina were at the mouth of the Mississippi, they were at the mouth of the largest of all rivers emptying into the Gulf on the northern coast. Whether

<sup>7</sup> Dunn, *op. cit.*, 39-40.

<sup>8</sup> This log has been published in translation by I. A. Leonard, "The Spanish Re-Exploration of the Gulf Coast in 1686," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXII, 1936, 551-557.

<sup>9</sup> Leonard, *loc. cit.*, 556.

<sup>10</sup> Dunn, *op. cit.*, 62.

<sup>11</sup> Leonard, *loc. cit.*, 556.

they realized it or not is irrelevant, for the point is that the Mississippi is actually the greatest of all the rivers of Florida, as the Southern United States was known in those days, and it had been described as such by the chroniclers of the De Soto expedition two centuries earlier.

In view of Jordán de la Reina's statements, the following passage from Dunn is somewhat surprising:

In his report to the viceroy, Palacios stated that he believed that the expedition had approached very close to the French colony, for if the voyage had not been interrupted the Mississippi River and Espiritu Santo Bay would doubtless have been reached some thirty leagues west of the Río de la Palizada (!)."<sup>12</sup>

I have been unable to secure this report of Palacios to the viceroy, wherein he is said to have mentioned the Mississippi River, but I very much doubt if he actually mentioned it. We have seen above that Dunn inserted in another letter of Palacios a "Río del Espíritu Santo," whereas in the letter itself there is no mention of such a river, but of a *Bahía de Misipipi*, which Palacios thought was the Bahía del Espíritu Santo shown on the maps which he consulted. According to Dunn himself, when the Spaniards were at the mouth of the Mississippi they little realized "that they had discovered the river for which they were seeking." As a matter of fact, the Spaniards were not looking for a river, but for the Bahía del Espíritu Santo where they thought that La Salle had planted his colony. Dunn continues:

Their failure to recognize [the Mississippi River] as such, however, is not surprising. That great stream was supposed to empty into the excellent harbor of Espiritu Santo Bay; but no bay was to be seen, and a river whose channel was obstructed by debris was not imagined to be the one which La Salle would have chosen for the site of his settlement.

Here and elsewhere throughout his book, Dunn is taking for granted, without any investigation, that the Río del Espíritu Santo shown on the Spanish maps was our Mississippi. This is a postulate unsupported by any evidence whatever.

Shortly after the return of the Barroto-Romero expedition Palacios went to Spain, where he summed up the result of the first maritime expedition as follows:

Today the whole coast of the Gulf of Mexico has been discovered and explored, with the exception of the strip from the mouth of the Río

<sup>12</sup> Dunn, *op. cit.*, 62-63.

de la Empalizada . . . to that of the Rio de Tampico. In this distance of about one hundred leagues lies the Bay of Espíritu Santo, and west of it the Rio Bravo and other rivers which may form sand banks.<sup>13</sup>

As we have seen, Jordán de la Reina thought that the Bahía del Espíritu Santo was west of the mouth of the Mississippi, "though not very much." At Vera Cruz Palacios interpreted this as "some thirty leagues." In order to determine approximately where the admiral located the Bahía del Espíritu Santo, this specific distance is not to be computed on that given by Jordán de la Reina from St. Marks to the mouth of the Mississippi—one hundred leagues according to him—but on the distance given by Palacios; namely, that which he says intervened between the mouth of the Mississippi and Tampico—also one hundred leagues. Thus according to Palacios, the Bahía del Espíritu Santo was situated about one third of the distance between the Rio de la Empalizada and Tampico, that is, between the Sabine River and Galveston Bay; and this again is approximately the location of the bay when its position on early Spanish sea charts of the Gulf of Mexico is transposed on a modern map.

The news of the French "invasion," as La Salle's expedition was called, reached Spain at about the time when Barroto and Romero returned to Vera Cruz from their exploratory journey. The authorities in Spain thought that the intruders had landed at the Bahía del Espíritu Santo, and remembering what Echagaray had written two years earlier, they judged that he knew the location of the famous bay and could guide a squadron to dislodge the French. Inquiries as to the present whereabouts of the pilot were made; when he was finally found at Cadiz, they ordered him to come to Seville. In his letter of 1684 Echagaray had said that if more definite information were needed with regard to the location of the Bahía del Espíritu Santo, he was prepared to give it "according to a sea chart which is in my possession."

This sea chart<sup>14</sup> was sent to the chairman of the Casa de la Contratación together with a letter dated April 20, 1686, which letter is nothing else than an explanation of the legends on the map.<sup>15</sup> The latter is a graphic representation combining what

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, 65, note 12, quoting the statement of Palacios, September 6, 1686, remitted by Oreytia to the Council of the Indies with a letter of September 28, 1686, AGI, Mexico, 61-6-20.

<sup>14</sup> It has no title and is in AGI, Mexico, 61-6-20 (1), photograph in the Karpinski Series of Reproductions; a tracing from a photograph of the original is reproduced in Dunn, *op. cit.*, 44.

<sup>15</sup> Echagaray to Oreytia, April 20, 1686, AGI, Mexico, 61-6-20.

Echagaray had written in 1684 and what Palacios wrote in 1685 after questioning the French prisoners at Vera Cruz. Echagaray's own source of information for La Salle's voyage came from a Spanish boatswain who had been taken prisoner by the French. During the voyage from the Caribbean to France, the captors of this boatswain gave him their version of La Salle's journey to the Gulf in 1682. The *laguna* crossed by the *frances descubridor* for instance, stands for the Great Lakes. From the boatswain Echagaray also learned that La Salle sailed on this *laguna* "until he arrived at the mouth of the two rivers which flow out of the said *laguna* to the *baya del espiritu santo*, as can be seen from the dots" on the map.

This dotted line, however, is inscribed not within the banks of one of the two rivers but within the banks of both, so that from the sketch it is impossible to know which one Echagaray thought was descended by La Salle. He very probably did not know. The two outlets of the *laguna* are possibly the two main routes taken by La Salle in his several exploratory journeys, *scl.*, up the St. Joseph River and down the Kankakee and up the Chicago River to the Des Plaines. In his letter of 1684, it will be recalled, Echagaray had spoken of two rivers emptying into the Bahía del Espíritu Santo. It was only natural that he should combine what he had been told by the Indians with what he had learned from the boatswain. In fact, he repeats in his letter of 1686 the information about the two rivers flowing into the Bahía del Espíritu Santo, adding what the Indians had told him about the ignorance of the headwaters of these rivers. "Hence I infer that these two rivers originate in the aforesaid *laguna*, and that this is the route which the said *frances descubridor* may have taken to come down to the *baya del espiritu santo*, and it is my opinion that he could not have followed another route to the Gulf of Mexico where the *baya del espiritu santo* is, as indicated [on the map] by the letter 'V.'" On this map, the bay within which the letter "V" is inscribed has the following legend: "Baya de lo Sp" S<sup>to</sup> Misipipi por otro nombre."

Here, therefore, just as in Palacios' report to the viceroy, it is clearly indicated that the *bay* which was called Espíritu Santo was the same as the *bay* which the prisoners told the admiral was named Misipipi. Echagaray gives no name to either of the two rivers followed by the *frances descubridor*, and does not call either of them Rio del Espíritu Santo. And yet, if the Mississippi had been known under that name, and had been as well known

as it is claimed, Echagaray would have unhesitatingly called the river which La Salle descended, Rio del Espíritu Santo.

Dunn prefaces his brief description of Echagaray's map by saying: "An examination of this rude sketch . . . will show concretely the meager knowledge possessed by the Spaniards concerning the interior of the North American continent."<sup>16</sup> This statement is too general, it should read "possessed by Echagaray." It is indeed hard to believe that in the last quarter of the seventeenth century the geographers of the Casa de la Contratación at least were so ignorant of the geography of the interior. Besides their own coastal manuscript maps, there were by that time scores of atlases and single printed maps everywhere in Europe, and most of the maps of Florida were ultimately based on maps made by former members of the Casa. Moreover, five years before Echagaray made this sketch, Thevenot had published a narrative of the Jolliet-Marquette expedition illustrated by a map showing the Mississippi from latitude 45° to the Gulf; on this map also, there are two tributaries of the Mississippi separated, by a short portage, from rivers emptying into Green Bay and into Lake Michigan. In 1683, that is, three years before the date of Echagaray's sketch, Hennepin had published his *Description de la Louisiane*, a book which was soon known all over Europe. In this book there was also a map of the Great Lakes which for all its defects gives an incomparably better picture of the St. Lawrence basin than the crude Echagaray drawing.

In September 1686, the new viceroy of Mexico, the Conde de Monclova, arrived at Vera Cruz with instructions from Madrid directing him to locate the French settlement and dislodge the intruders. He summoned the two pilots of the 1685-1686 expedition and learned from them of their fruitless search for La Salle's colony, which was thought to be planted on the Bahía del Espíritu Santo. Barroto and Romero were again chosen as pilots of the expedition sent out by Monclova. Sailing northward along the coast from Vera Cruz, they disregarded the names inscribed on their maps, and rechristened prominent landmarks; it was at this time that Matagorda Bay, for instance, was named San Bernardo. Continuing their journey northward, they finally reached the Rio de la Palizada. The same two pilots had thus explored the whole Gulf Coast from Vera Cruz to the tip of the Florida peninsula. Not having found any bay which fitted the

<sup>16</sup> Dunn, *op. cit.*, 45.



description of the Bahía del Espíritu Santo, they concluded that the only bay which corresponded somewhat with it must be Mobile Bay, where they arrived May 22, and spent three days exploring its waters.<sup>17</sup>

The next two paragraphs contain our comments on Dunn's conclusions regarding this identification. "No great river corresponding to the Mississippi or Rio del Espíritu Santo was found flowing into [Mobile Bay]." As we have repeatedly seen, the identification of the two rivers is purely gratuitous, for it supposes what should be proved. In this expedition as in the first, the Spaniards were not looking for a river, great or small, but for a bay where they expected to find the French settlement. On their way up the coast they had examined Matagorda Bay and had found the wreckage of a vessel which, they were convinced, had belonged to the French colony. "Instead [in Mobile Bay] six small streams were found, which could not be navigated even by such small boats as the pirogues." This would seem to indicate that the northern part of the bay was not explored. "In spite of the absence of a large river, however, the Spaniards concluded that they must be at the bay which was shown on the maps as Espíritu Santo." There was no Bahía del Espíritu Santo on the maps where Mobile Bay is, but a bay of that name is shown 500 miles farther west. The pilots' identification is partly based on *a priori* premises; namely, that La Salle must have planted his colony on a bay fit for settlement. As a matter of fact he had landed at one of the least suitable spots of the Gulf Coast, where, as Dunn observes on the preceding page, "the region was so low and swampy that the Spaniards seem to have been convinced that no sane person would attempt to settle there."

"No other body of water [except Mobile Bay] offered any inducements for settlement; . . ." Yet Pensacola Bay, only forty miles away, was much better suited than Mobile Bay both with regard to settlement and with regard to harbor facilities. ". . . Or corresponded so closely to the general description that had been given of Espíritu Santo Bay." This description, whatever it may have been, was derived from maps; and if this description applied to a bay on the northern coast, it corresponded much more closely, both regarding shape and position, to Galveston Bay than to Mobile Bay. Furthermore the characteristic feature in any description of the Bahía del Espíritu Santo is that on the northern shore of this bay a river of the

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, 75-77.

same name flows into it. Now, the fact that the explorers only mention six small rivers which could not be navigated by their pirogues, shows that they did not find this characteristic trait. Again, the famous bay is described as an excellent port; but in sounding the entrance of Mobile Bay they only found between twenty and twenty-two spans of water, which even for seventeenth-century ocean-going vessels, would not make an excellent harbor. "In this uncertain fashion was the long-sought-for bay identified, but, no doubt, with entire correctness." Actually, the correctness of this identification is more than doubtful. To say nothing of its difference in shape and its position on the northern coast line, as well as the absence of a large river emptying into it, and the shallow entrance of this bay, there is the fact that these pilots could not have "recognized" this bay, because, as we have seen, they did not identify Mobile Bay with the Bahía del Espíritu Santo on their previous voyage thither.<sup>18</sup>

The only plausible explanation for this identification would seem to be the following. All that the Spaniards knew with regard to the position of the Bahía del Espíritu Santo was that their old maps located it in the northwest corner of the Gulf. When Barroto and Romero explored the eastern part of the Gulf Coast in their first expedition, they had assumed that the bay was situated west of the Rio de la Palizada. When they explored the western part of the coast, not finding any bay corresponding to what they expected; namely, an immense bay, a small sea, *mar pequeña*, which was at the same time an excellent harbor, and not wishing to discard a cartographical feature a century and a half old, they called Mobile Bay Bahía del Espíritu Santo. Two years later, when Alonso de León finally found the ruins of La Salle's settlement on the Garcitas River, he was much more logical in calling Matagorda Bay Bahía del Espíritu Santo,<sup>19</sup> because even since the time the Spaniards heard of the coming

<sup>18</sup> Scaife also identified the Bahía del Espíritu Santo with Mobile Bay. When he wrote his essay, however, he had no knowledge of the documents brought to light by Dunn. As we noted in the first of these articles, *supra*, XXV, 1943, 190, Scaife's main reason for denying that the Mississippi was the Rio del Espíritu Santo of the Spanish geographers is because, on their maps, the river is shown to empty into a large bay, and this, he rightly contends, cannot be said of the Mississippi in historical times. The texts of the early Spanish chroniclers which he uses to identify the Bahía del Espíritu Santo with Mobile Bay prove nothing at all; and the texts from the writings of the French explorers have no bearing on this identification.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. the itinerary of Alonso de León in H. E. Bolton, ed., *Spanish Exploration of the Southwest 1542-1706*, New York, 1930, 388, 399-400; the letter of Father Massanet, *ibid.*, 353, 362-363; the opinion of Pez and Barroto on De León's itinerary, W. J. O'Donnell, ed., "La Salle's Occupation of Texas," *MID-AMERICA*, XVIII, 1936, 119.



of the French to the Gulf, they were convinced that they had landed at a bay of that name. Yet Matagorda Bay certainly did not correspond to the general description of the Bahía del Espíritu Santo as it appeared on the maps. With regard to shape it corresponded much more closely than Mobile Bay; and its distance from the position indicated on the maps of the Bahía del Espíritu Santo is only one fourth as great as that of Mobile Bay.

Even if, against the evidence, one were to hold that Mobile Bay was the Bahía del Espíritu Santo, it is quite obvious, as we pointed out when discussing Echagaray's letter of 1684, that the Mississippi was not the Rio del Espíritu Santo of the Spanish geographers.

The search for La Salle's colony led to the occupation of Pensacola by the Spaniards. This episode is mentioned here, because during the preliminaries to the actual founding of Pensacola the Spanish explorers often refer to the Bahía del Espíritu Santo and to the Mississippi. The diaries of the pilots of the preparatory journeys to Pensacola Bay are lost, but we have the writings of Sigüenza y Góngora, who, at that time, had a better knowledge, both theoretical and practical, of the Gulf Coast than anyone in Europe and in America, with the probable exception of his pupil Barroto. Besides this fundamental evidence, there are other reports and letters which will be examined in the following pages.

The earliest of these writings is the so-called Pez memorial,<sup>20</sup> a paper based on the findings of Barroto, wherein its alleged author,<sup>21</sup> Andrés de Pez, advocates the occupancy of Pensacola Bay by the Spaniards. A good index of how well the geography of the Gulf Coast was "generally known" in Spain is to be found in the opinion of the Marqués de la Granja who, in the name of the Council of the Indies, rejected Pez' proposal to colonize and fortify Pensacola. The *fiscal*, who had reported favorably on the project, had added that "a consideration of the reasons which obliged the Junta to drive the French out of Espíritu Santo bay (when it was said that they had occupied it) moves me to feel that the same thing ought to be done at Pensacola Bay." To this the Marqués de la Granja answered:

Both [projects], apparently, were formed without reflection on or knowledge of the real motives for that effort which grew out of the

<sup>20</sup> I. A. Leonard, ed. and transl., *Spanish Approach to Pensacola, 1689-1693*, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1939, 77-92.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Dunn, *op. cit.*, 147, note 2, and 177; Leonard, *op. cit.*, 24-25, and 95.

understanding that the bay called Espíritu Santo was less than a hundred leagues from Vera Cruz and an equal distance from Mexico city. This belief was also the reason for requiring an examination of that port, for, according to the position assigned it and placed on the sea charts, it lay outside of the gulf of New Spain and around Negrillo reefs. Consequently, consideration was given to the advantages it possessed over Vera Cruz as a port of entry and departure in any season without fear of the "northers" which, as is well known, cause great concern in both the vicinity of Vera Cruz and Mexico city. But the same arguments do not hold now because of the great distance between the two places; the bay is more than three hundred leagues away on the coast running north and south, and in a position as much out of the way as though it were in the innermost part of the inlet called Carlos bay.<sup>22</sup>

One need not be a professional geographer to be startled by the Marqués de la Granja's fantastic geography of the Gulf of Mexico. According to him the Bahía del Espíritu Santo was "around Negrillo reefs," that is, one hundred miles from the northern coast of the Yucatan Peninsula. And this statement was made by a member of the Council of the Indies under whose eyes there was a map of the Gulf of Mexico made by the technicians of the Casa de la Contratación. The bay spoken of at the end of the above quotation, is the Bahía del Espíritu Santo on the west coast of the Florida peninsula, where nobody in Mexico ever thought of going to find La Salle's colony.

The Marqués de los Vélez to whom the viceroy of Mexico, the Conde de Galve, had written in support of the plan for fortifying Pensacola, also gave his opinion on the matter. He repeated what the Marqués de la Granja had said with regard to the former belief that the Bahía del Espíritu Santo was near Vera Cruz and Mexico, and that its position was outside the Gulf of New Spain and around Negrillo reefs. But he improved upon his colleague by saying that Pensacola Bay and not the Bahía del Espíritu Santo is out of the way "and in the innermost part of the inlet called Carlos bay." The whole question of driving La Salle out of the Gulf of Mexico, he wrote, arose from the fact that he was believed to be close to Vera Cruz and Mexico City.

Now we know that the San Bernardo lagoon is more than 180 leagues by sea from the port of Vera Cruz, and that ships cannot anchor in it, judging by what the pilots who have been there again and again have observed, and by what Monsieur La Salle found by experience in wrecking his ships so completely that not even the smallest could get

<sup>22</sup> Leonard, *op. cit.*, 103-104.

out. Consequently, this new matter has an entirely different aspect, especially in the proposal to fortify Pensacola bay, which is more than 200 leagues from San Bernardo lagoon and, therefore, 380 from the port of Vera Cruz, and more than 700 by land from Mexico city, judging by the reports of the viceroy and the logs of the pilots who sailed along the gulf of Mexico. So, any conquest attempted by land is impracticable even if the bay were occupied and fortified by the French (which is not the case), for there is a distance of 400 leagues from the outermost missionary posts in the provinces of New Mexico and Coahuila . . . to Pensacola.<sup>23</sup>

After the plan to occupy and fortify Pensacola Bay had finally received the king's approval, the viceroy of Mexico wrote to Charles II in answer to the objections raised in Spain against the project.

I am obliged, Sir, to state that at no time could one believe that Espíritu Santo bay was 100 leagues from Vera Cruz and an equal distance from Mexico city, for on the maps, both ancient and modern, it was located on the coast of the gulf of Mexico running east and west, 240 leagues from Vera Cruz, and more than 450 by land from Mexico city; nor does the bay appear on the maps outside the gulf of New Spain and around Negrillo reefs, for the entire coast lying between Cape Apalachee [?] and Cape Cotoche [Catoche] falls within this gulf. Consequently, Espíritu Santo bay, which is the same as the one called Mobile bay by the reconnoitering expeditions recently completed, can not be outside of the Gulf. Mobile bay is well protected from "northers," but its entrance is too shallow for ocean-going vessels.

The Committee has confused this bay with San Bernardo lagoon, . . . and they have taken it for Espíritu Santo bay, which is quite different. The lagoon is at the western end of the gulf coast line running east and west, in the middle of which is Espíritu Santo bay. But the one that we and other nations have not known hitherto is Pensacola Bay, seventeen leagues east of Espíritu Santo, and the only inlet on the Gulf shore into which . . . ocean-going vessels can enter; it is also within the gulf of Mexico and protected from the "northers." And so since this bay is distinct from the Espíritu Santo bay found by the early discoverers, and also different from San Bernardo lagoon, which the Committee mistook for Espíritu Santo, our fears regarding the purposes of the most Christi king remain valid. . . . That [Pensacola Bay] is 240 leagues from Vera Cruz,<sup>24</sup> as the map on the

<sup>23</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, 115-116.

<sup>24</sup> It is said in the Pez memorial: "Two hundred and forty leagues northeast by north of Vera Cruz, at thirty degrees and a half north latitude and on the same meridian as Lagartos river on the coast of Yucatan, Captain Juan Enriquez Barroto found this bay of Pensacola," Leonard, *op. cit.*, 79. What the editor means, *ibid.*, 96, note, is not quite clear: "Pensacola bay was nearer twenty degrees north latitude from Vera Cruz." Vera Cruz

secretariat of the Council plainly shows, and not 380 leagues as the Committee asserts, is a fact, for the distance from Vera Cruz to San Bernardo lagoon must not be added to that from the latter to Pensacola because the three ports form a triangle. No one would claim it necessary to go via San Bernardo lagoon insailing to Pensacola or *vice versa*; therefore, the Committee did not make a proper calculation of the distance.<sup>25</sup>

A few comments and rectifications are in place here. This geographical information came from Sigüenza, and incidentally it shows that in Mexico people knew the geography of the Gulf much better than did the Council of the Indies or the Junta de Guerra. The obvious reason for this more adequate knowledge is the fact that there were then in Mexico trained pilots who, during the previous years, had explored the Gulf Coast from the Florida Keys to Vera Cruz.

We have seen how the pilots of the second maritime expedition came to identify Mobile Bay with the Bahía del Espíritu Santo of the old maps. Until the year of his death, 1696, the viceroy repeated this identification in his letters, but the explorers and seamen who sailed along the northern coast, except when repeating in their reports what the viceroy had written to them, call it simply Mobile Bay.<sup>26</sup> The records do not bear out Galve's contention that the Junta de Guerra or the Council of the Indies confused Mobile Bay with San Bernardo. Later, when the authorities in Spain had received the report of Alonso de León and called Matagorda Bay Bahía del Espíritu Santo, they were repeating the identification of the governor of Coahuila. The viceroy's assertion that Espíritu Santo is in the middle of the northern coast of the Gulf goes counter to the position of this bay as it appears on every map drawn since the late twenties of the sixteenth century. We can readily admit that Pensacola Bay is distinct from the Bahía del Espíritu Santo of the early discoverers; as a matter of fact, these two were never alleged to

is 19° N. latitude; Pensacola 30° 30' N. latitude. "Considering the Spanish league about three miles long, the two hundred and forty leagues indicated by Sigüenza y Góngora were around a hundred miles shorter than the actual distance." Sigüenza speaks here of the Spanish sea league which was slightly more than 3.9 miles long; hence Pensacola was 940 statute miles from Vera Cruz in a northeast by north direction, the actual distance is 945 statute miles. Sigüenza's figure, 240 leagues, was obtained by laying the *tronco de leguas* on any seventeenth-century sea chart of the Gulf.

<sup>25</sup> Leonard, *op. cit.*, 125-126.

<sup>26</sup> On none of the Spanish manuscript maps of the Gulf of Mexico which I have seen, is Mobile Bay called Bahía del Espíritu Santo, but this name is given to Matagorda Bay and alternates with that of Lago de San Bernardo, the name given to this bay in 1687.



be the same; what is not admissible is that Pensacola Bay was not known to the early discoverers, for Sigüenza himself declares that it was known to them as *Achussi*.

In pursuance of the royal decree of June 26, 1692, authorizing the exploration of the northern coast so as to find a suitable place for a settlement, an expedition was organized. The most important document written on this occasion is the description of the northern coast of the Gulf from Pensacola to the mouth of the Mississippi by Don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora.<sup>27</sup> His instructions ordered him to make plans of the various bays and a map of the coast.<sup>28</sup> Of this cartographical work only the plan of Pensacola has survived.<sup>29</sup> "As the map of the coast line from Pensacola Bay to Mobile and from there to the mouth of the Mississippi, if Sigüenza y Góngora actually drew one, has not come to light, it is impossible to identify precisely many of the landmarks mentioned."<sup>30</sup> While this is regrettable, it has no bearing on the object of our inquiry.

The doubt expressed in the above quotation is quite reasonable. It is not certain that Sigüenza drew a map of the coast line, because it appears from his journal that he used a map made on previous expeditions, probably one of his pupil Barroto, as can be seen from a comparison of the nomenclature in the journal of Jordán de la Reina with that in Sigüenza's journal and in his letter of June 16, 1699.<sup>31</sup> "The nearest contemporary maps available are those of French origin, and the geographical features of the region bear the names which Frenchmen bestowed upon them."<sup>32</sup> These Frenchmen, however, had copies of the Spanish maps made between 1686 and 1693, on which are found quite a

<sup>27</sup> Cf. I. A. Leonard, *Don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora, a Mexican Savant of the Seventeenth Century*, Berkeley, California, 1929; a brief sketch by the same author will be found in *The Mercurio Volante of Don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora*, Los Angeles, 1932, 21-27; and in *Spanish Approach to Pensacola*, 38-43.

<sup>28</sup> Leonard, *Spanish Approach*, 153.

<sup>29</sup> The original is in AGI, Mexico, 61-6-21 (1), photograph in the Karpinski Series of Reproductions; a tracing from a photograph is printed in Dunn, *Spanish and French Rivalry*, facing p. 160; actual size reproduction in color, Leonard, *Spanish Approach to Pensacola*. Two other maps by Sigüenza are in the same legajo, one showing the route of Alonso de León to Matagorda Bay in 1689, cf. "The Sources of the Delisle Map of America, 1703," *MID-AMERICA*, XXV, 1943, 298; the other illustrating De León's itinerary from Monclova to the Neches River. Photographs of both are in the Karpinski Series of Reproductions; the second is reproduced in H. E. Bolton, *Spanish Exploration of the Southwest*, facing p. 370.

<sup>30</sup> Leonard, *Spanish Approach*, 191, note 55.

<sup>31</sup> Informe de Don Carlos de Sigüenza, June 16, 1699, AGI, Mexico, 61-6-22.

<sup>32</sup> Leonard, *Spanish Approach*, 191, note 55.

few place-names which appeared on the lost maps. By means of these French maps as well as of eighteenth-century Spanish maps, most of the fundamental nomenclature of the originals can be reconstructed; this reconstruction, however, interesting though it may be, has no place here; but the following points are pertinent.

First, the Mississippi is called by the name given to it at the time of the first maritime expedition of 1686, and there is not the slightest suggestion that the Spaniards believed this to have been the Rio del Espíritu Santo shown on their old maps. Secondly, except when they repeat the Conde de Galve's instructions neither Pez nor Sigüenza ever call Mobile Bay Bahía del Espíritu Santo, a name to which the viceroy was so much attached. But even if they had, and even if they had drawn the conclusion that the river which empties into the northern part of this bay was the Rio del Espíritu Santo, this would not identify it with the Mississippi. Thirdly, where Sigüenza gives his reasons for beginning a settlement on the banks of the Almirante [Blackwater] River, he says:

It may be inferred from the remarkable width and depth of this river that its source is at considerable height, and that it is an outlet of one of the Great Lakes formed by the St. Lawrence or Canada river. Whatever it is, in coming down from the hinterland one can have full use of the valuable resources in the various provinces through the easy navigation along this river. That was the only reason for Robert La Salle's explorations, journeys, and ultimate ruin. What he in his fancy sought to accomplish by the Colbert river, we ourselves possess with indeed more than legal right.<sup>33</sup>

When Sigüenza wrote this report, he had already seen the Mississippi. Since he speaks of the Blackwater River as though it were comparable to the Mississippi itself, we can readily understand how other Spaniards at an earlier date might have been greatly impressed by the size of the Trinity River. The fact that the Trinity River flows into a bay, and that this bay is very similar in shape to the Bahía del Espíritu Santo as represented on old maps, and finally, that the bay is located in the northwest corner of the Gulf, would be so many added reasons for identifying the Rio del Espíritu Santo with the Trinity River, and the Bahía del Espíritu Santo with Galveston Bay.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>33</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, 182.

<sup>34</sup> In *L'expédition de Cavelier de la Salle dans le Golfe du Mexique (1684-1687)*, Paris, 1931, 54, De Villiers writes as follows: "La véritable baie de Spiritu Sancto était incontestablement la baie actuelle de Galves-

## IX

In spite of all the good reports about the value of Pensacola, and in spite of the royal order of June 13, 1694,<sup>1</sup> instructing the viceroy to begin without further delay the occupation and fortification of the Bahía Santa María de Galve, as the bay had been christened by Sigüenza,<sup>2</sup> little effort was made to carry out the recommendations contained in the *cédula*. But shortly after the signing of the Treaty of Ryswick, September 20, 1697, the news reached Spain that Louis XIV was preparing to found a colony in the Gulf of Mexico and to occupy some port there, presumably Pensacola. This news shook the lethargy of the Spanish government as nothing else could have done.<sup>3</sup> Every means of forestalling the French was taken, and as is well known, the Spaniards won the race by two months.

When the royal *cédula* reached Mexico City, July 14, 1698, the viceroy, José Sarmiento de Valladares, Conde de Moctezuma, called in Sigüenza and Andrés de Arriola.<sup>4</sup> Both wrote memoranda on the situation, and that of Arriola was made official.<sup>5</sup> This report is of interest because it is the only one of all the official documents of the period in which the Mississippi is identified not with the Rio del Espíritu Santo but with the Rio Grande of the chroniclers of the De Soto expedition. Besides exploring

---

ton." He bases this positive identification on the position and shape of the bay as it appears on a few early maps which he consulted, but above all on three passages of *La Cosmographie avec l'esperance et le régime du Soleil et du Nord*, by Jean Fonteneau dit Alphonse de Saintonge, G. Musset, ed., Paris, 1904. Two of De Villiers' suppositions are erroneous; firstly, that Alphonse sailed in the Gulf of Mexico up to the northern coast; secondly, that the "anse du Figuyer" is the Gulf. His identifying the "grande rivière qui est toute plaine de bapures" with the Mississippi will not stand examination, for Alphonse's distance, forty leagues from Cape Sable along the west coast of Florida, would place the mouth of this "Mississippi" at the latitude of Charlotte Bay. To try to make sense out of Alphonse's text on pages 509, 513, and 514, is a hopeless task, as can be verified by transposing his data on a modern map. He speaks indifferently of a "baye du Saint Esperit," and of a "goulfe du Saint Esperit"; of an "anse du Figuyer," and of a "cap du Figuyer." We find on one of the Dieppe maps a "p. de figeras," on another a "p. des figeras," and on a third "las higueras"; while the Cabot map has "C. de igueras." All these legends are inscribed in present-day Gulf of Honduras. See the map entitled "L'anse du Figuyer," *Cosmographie*, 504. Alphonse evidently translated the Spanish word into French.

<sup>1</sup> Dunn, *Spanish and French Rivalry*, 171.

<sup>2</sup> Leonard, *Spanish Approach*, 155-156.

<sup>3</sup> Dunn, *op. cit.*, 173-176.

<sup>4</sup> On Arriola, cf. I. A. Leonard, "Don Andrés de Arriola and the Occupation of Pensacola Bay," in *New Spain and the Anglo-American West*, 2 volumes, privately printed, Los Angeles, 1932, I, 81-102; also Dunn, *Spanish and French Rivalry*, 176, note 50.

<sup>5</sup> Dunn, *op. cit.*, 177-179.



the country around Pensacola, Arriola wrote, a close examination should also be made of the coast

from Pensacola to Mobile Bay and from there to the mouth of the river which we call Rio de la Palizada and the French call Colbert, which is located thirty leagues or thereabouts west of Mobile Bay. For I am certain that this was the river which M. de la Salle came to find, and not finding it, went to the San Bernardino [*sic*] lagoon where he planted his colony. [In 1695] I visited the mouth of this river which appeared to me of very great volume (*muy caudaloso*) and seemed to be that which was called Rio Grande by those who went inland with the *adelantado* Hernando de Soto, navigating it on ships made [on its banks] for more than 400 leagues before they reached the sea. An exploration should also be made of the Rio de disco [*sic*] mentioned in his report by Don Carlos de Sigüenza, which is called [Rio] del Almirante, ascending it as far as possible, since it is navigable; because it may be a branch of the [Rio] de la Palizada; and since it is rather large, I suspect that the French may now come to take possession of its mouth, for they have more information about it than M. de la Salle did. In my opinion, it is no less important to occupy the mouth of this river, if it should turn out to be navigable and could be fortified, because of the length of its course, which can be conjectured from the Relation written by Father Fray Louis Hennepin, who accompanied M. de la Salle in his explorations; for the river has its source in the lakes of New France.<sup>6</sup>

While Arriola was writing his report, Iberville was making ready for his expedition to the Gulf. An account of these preparations, of the voyage itself, of his contact with the Spaniards at Pensacola, and of his finding of the mouth of the Mississippi, March 2, 1699, would be out of place here.<sup>7</sup> What is pertinent is to determine whether the French in the last years of the seventeenth century knew if the great river had once been called the Rio del Espíritu Santo. We have seen with what river Bernou, Coronelli, and others who had a theoretical knowledge of the geography of North America, identified the Mississippi. These opinions are summarized in the letter which Claude Delisle wrote to Cassini<sup>8</sup> and which was published in the *Journal des Sçavans*, May 10, 1700. In this letter the geographer says that when he wished to determine the position of the mouth of the Mississippi he had no reliable data, no astronomical observations, and more-

<sup>6</sup> Ynforme de Dn Andrés de Arriola, July 16, 1698, AGI, Mexico, 61-2-22.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. G. Frégault, *Iberville le Conquérant*, Montreal, 1944, "L'exploration du Mississippi et la colonisation de la Louisiane," 264-301.

<sup>8</sup> On the authorship of this letter, cf. "The Sources of the Delisle Map of America, 1703," *MID-AMERICA*, XXV, 1943, 279.

over, "the Mississippi River is not marked on any of the maps," with the exception, he continues, of Nolin's map. He then goes on to say that in the 1680's "it was a much debated question among those interested [in geography] to know exactly where the Mississippi River emptied into the sea." The difficulty of determining where its mouth was situated increased after the return of Beaujeu from the Gulf of Mexico, because neither he nor La Salle had found it.

Since on no map of the coast of Florida was there any river to which one dared apply what was being said of the Mississippi, there were some, and the late M. Thevenot was one of them, who maintained that it had no noticeable mouth and that it lost itself either in the interior or in the coastal lagoons; for it is certain that the coast of Florida is very low and that the soil deposits brought down by the river have formed along the coast several islands which will one day be joined to the mainland as has happened in many other places in the world.

Others, especially M. l'abbé Bernou, maintained that this could not be, and that a river corresponding to the description hitherto given must have a large and deep mouth. Others still thought they saved appearances by saying that the Mississippi was the river which the Spaniards called Rio Escondido, and such was the opinion of Father Coronelli, as can be seen on the map which the Sieur Nolin, his engraver, has published.<sup>9</sup>

On this map, the Mississippi River empties into the sea at the western end of the Gulf of Mexico.<sup>10</sup>

Here we have an account of the theories about the Mississippi which were current in France during the last twenty years of the seventeenth century, as set forth by the foremost geographer of the day. He does not give the least indication that he himself or any of his contemporaries thought of the Mississippi as the Rio del Espíritu Santo. On three Delisle drafts made in 1696,<sup>11</sup> the course of the Mississippi is based on the account of La Salle's expedition as related in Le Clercq's *Premier Etablissement de la Foy dans la Nouvelle France*. The coast line is taken from one of the many maps in print at the time. On two of these drafts the river is called "Mississipi," but on the third, near its mouth

<sup>9</sup> This is probably the map published at Paris in 1689; see Lowery, *A Descriptive List of Maps*, 181-182, no. 192. For all that pertains to the course of the Mississippi, it is similar to the other Coronelli maps.

<sup>10</sup> "Lettre de M. Delisle a M. Cassini, sur l'embouchure de la riviere de Mississipi," *Journal des Sçavans*, May 10, 1700, 204. The differences in the wording of the printed version and of the manuscript draft of this passage, ASH, 115-10: no. 17 B, are negligible.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. "The Sources of the Delisle Map of America, 1703," *MID-AMERICA*, XXV, 1943, 279.

he inscribed the following legend: "Mississipi ou Grande riviere nomme par les Espagnols Rio Escondido."<sup>12</sup> As is to be expected, on the three maps there is a Rio del Espíritu Santo which empties into Apalachee Bay; and east of the mouth of the Mississippi we have the usual Baye du Saint-Esprit. A simplified version of these drafts of 1696 appeared on the gores of his 1700 globe. On his map of America published late in 1700, there is a "B. du St. Esprit" designating Breton Sound. Considering that on the later Delisle maps this name is never used, we must inquire why he inscribed it on the 1700 map in this part of the Gulf.

When Iberville was preparing his expedition he consulted old maps similar to those which Palacios had consulted ten years earlier. This is clear both from an anonymous memoir of 1698<sup>13</sup> and from the plan which he submitted to Pontchartrain under date of June 18, 1698:

On leaving Santo Domingo, I shall sail [northward] to reconnoiter the coast, [landing] fifty or sixty leagues to the west of the Florida peninsula. I shall then follow the coast observing it well, especially the rivers, to the baye du Saint-Esprit where all my ships will gather. I shall enter this bay and shall carefully examine it to see whether the Mississippi empties into it.<sup>14</sup>

This Baye du Saint-Esprit, he thought, was only about one hundred leagues from the "Baye St. Louis," to wit, Matagorda Bay. If the Baye du Saint-Esprit was a good port, he would build a fort there; if, however, Matagorda Bay were a better port, he intended to fortify it instead of the Baye du Saint-Esprit.

There is no question of the Mississippi being the Rio del Espíritu Santo, even though Iberville thought the river might perhaps empty into the Bahía del Espíritu Santo. For, as we have seen, both Beaujeu and Minet also considered this possibility, but the latter's map makes it quite clear that he refers not to the Rio del Espíritu Santo, but to the Chucagua; and Iberville himself, after returning from his first voyage, positively identified the Chucagua with the Mississippi.<sup>15</sup>

But as Iberville's preparations progressed, more recent maps

<sup>12</sup> The Spaniards did not call the Mississippi Rio Escondido. As we have seen, La Salle is the first one who made this identification, which Coronelli made known to the world in his *Atlante Veneto*.

<sup>13</sup> BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 21398:209-209v.

<sup>14</sup> Margry, IV, 53.

<sup>15</sup> "Le Chicagoua est le Mississipi," in copy by Claude Delisle of the "Reponse de Mr. d'Iberville a une lettre de Mr. Toinard sur la cote de Floride et de la riviere de Mississipi," September 11, 1699, ASH, 115-10:no. 6.

of the Gulf embodying the results of its survey by the Spanish pilots of the various expeditions sent to find La Salle's colony reached the French. We called attention above to the manner in which manuscripts fell into the hands of nationals of other countries, and added that some maps were obtained in the same way.<sup>16</sup> Among the booty found on a Spanish ship captured by the French in 1697 there was a new map of the Gulf. The captain of the French ship brought the map to Toulon. Nicolas de la Salle, the namesake of the explorer, who had descended the Mississippi with La Salle in 1682, was living at Toulon at that time. When he learned that preparations were being made to send ships to the Gulf, he wrote to Pontchartrain, August 14, 1698, informing the minister that he had some knowledge of the mouth of the Mississippi, and that he had this map of the Gulf. In his answer, the minister asked for details of this knowledge and told La Salle to send with his report "the map which had been found on the ship of the vice-admiral of the Armadille, taken by the *Bon* in 1697."<sup>17</sup> Nicolas de la Salle hastened to comply with this request, and on September 3 sent his report together "with a copy of the map of the coast of the Gulf of Mexico. M. Patoulet, captain [of the *Bon*] has the original parchment."<sup>18</sup> We know that this map was a recent one, quite different with regard to nomenclature from those previously possessed by the French, because a "rivière de la Palissade"<sup>19</sup> was indicated on it, a name which was first given to the Mississippi by Jordán de la Reina in 1686, the year of the first maritime expedition sent to find La Salle's colony.

The *Badine*, commanded by Iberville, and the *Marin*, commanded by Surgères, arrived at Cap Français [Cap Haitien, Haiti], December 4, 1698. Two weeks later Iberville wrote from this place: "I shall follow my first intention which is to search for it [the Mississippi] in the vicinity of the *baye de Lago de Lodo*."<sup>20</sup> This name is a mistaken reading on the part of Iberville, for it does not appear on any Spanish maps of the period. Instead, the legend *Cabo de Lodo* appears on the Spanish maps after 1686 at the tip of one of the "fingers" of the delta,<sup>21</sup> and the expanse of water between the delta and the mainland to the

<sup>16</sup> *Supra*, XXV, 1943, 219, note 43.

<sup>17</sup> Nicolas de la Salle to Pontchartrain, August 27, 1698, Margry, IV, 82.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.* to [id.], September 3, 1698, ASH, 111-1: no. 18.

<sup>19</sup> De Boissieux to ———, January 7, 1698, Margry, IV, 44.

<sup>20</sup> Iberville to Pontchartrain, December 19, 1698, *ibid.*, 89.

<sup>21</sup> Dunn, *Spanish and French Rivalry*, 62.

north was called *Laguna de Pez*.<sup>22</sup> That the map which Iberville used actually had the legend Cabo de Lodo instead of Lago de Lodo, is evident from a letter which Chasteaumorant wrote to the minister after his return to France.<sup>23</sup>

On this map there was also a Rio de la Palizada, but not until the following February did Iberville begin to suspect that this Rio was the Mississippi. In a letter which he wrote to Pontchartrain from Léogane on December 31, 1698, he says: "I heard nothing about the Mississippi here, nobody has any definite idea as to where it is, nor has anyone sailed along that coast; I shall, therefore, follow my original plan and sail to the coast of Florida."<sup>24</sup> In a second letter to Pontchartrain, which is in the form of a journal, under date of February 4, he says that he has decided to "follow the coast to the rivière des Palissades which is twenty-five or thirty leagues from Mobile [Bay]"; and a week later, after anchoring off Ship Island, he wrote that he was first going to explore the "bay," that is, the expanse of water formed by the Mississippi Sound and Lake Borgne where he then was, and afterward "sail along the coast to the rivière de la Palissade which is the Mississippi, between fifteen and twenty leagues from here."<sup>25</sup>

Iberville had arrived at the latter conclusion by piecing together the information which he had received from various sources. Besides the map received from Pontchartrain, he had obtained another one at Santo Domingo,<sup>26</sup> and in addition it is likely that he saw the map given to the brother of one of Chasteaumorant's officers there.<sup>27</sup> Moreover, a Spanish pilot, Juan Vicente, boarded the *Badine* at Petit Goave.<sup>28</sup> Iberville also knew of the information which Chasteaumorant had received

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Dunn, *op. cit.*, 162, and the map in AGI, Mexico, 61-6-17, photograph in the Karpinski Series of Reproductions; tracing from a photograph of the original in Dunn, 163. Sigüenza wrote: "desde el Cabo de lodo a la mouilla que distan entre si por Mar y camino derecho Como treinta y Cinco leguas se forma Vna grandissima ensenada en que se hallan esparsidos infinitos Caios que son isletas de barro Arena y Mucara de varios Tamaños entre los quales ai dos trechos grandes de mar limpio que son la ensenada de Barroto . . . [y] la laguna de Pez que es el otro pedazo de mar limpio," Informe de Don Carlos de Sigüenza, June 16, 1699, AGI, Mexico, 61-6-22.

<sup>23</sup> Chasteaumorant to Pontchartrain, June 23, 1699, Margry, IV, 104.

<sup>24</sup> Iberville to Pontchartrain, December 31, 1698, *ibid.*, 91.

<sup>25</sup> *Id.* to *id.*, February 11, 1699, *ibid.*, 99. The log of the *Badine* under date of February 27 has the following: "I left the ships . . . for the Mississippi, which the Indians of these parts call Malbanchya, and the Spaniards [rivière] de la Palissade," *ibid.*, 157.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. the log of the *Badine*, *ibid.*, 149, and ASH, 115-10: no. 17 Z.

<sup>27</sup> Chasteaumorant to Pontchartrain, June 23, 1699, Margry, IV, 110.

<sup>28</sup> Ducasse to *id.*, January 13, 1699, *ibid.*, 92; Dunn, *Spanish and French Rivalry*, 187.



from the notorious Flemish corsair Laurent De Graff,<sup>29</sup> from Martínez at Pensacola, and especially from the "piloto real" loaned by Arriola.<sup>30</sup>

The details received from this last source were of considerable importance. Martínez, who came on board the *François* with this pilot, was asked many questions, "especially about the Palizada, San Bernardo, the Rio Bravo, and Pánuco"; he gave his host "little information, beyond stating that all those places were very shallow and uninviting."<sup>31</sup> But before dismissing the "piloto real," Chasteaumont asked him if he had any knowledge of the Mississippi.

He told me that he had not, but that he had heard of a river which was called the river of Canada, and which was located beyond the San Diego Islands,<sup>32</sup> but there was practically no water at its mouth. The freshets had brought down a very great quantity of trees which had formed a kind of bar, so that there was not, he thought, more than one fathom of water at its entrance. Moreover, the current was exceedingly strong.<sup>33</sup>

The pilot was, of course, describing the mouth of the Mississippi, as the French found out a month later. On March 2, 1699, Iberville wrote in the log of the *Badine* that "its appearance made me realize that it was the rivière de la Palissade which appeared to me well christened, for its mouth . . . seems to be blocked by these rocks,"<sup>34</sup> namely, by the driftwood incrustated with mud. How he later came to the conclusion that this was the

<sup>29</sup> Iberville to Pontchartrain, December 19, 1698, Margry, IV, 88; Ducasse to *id.*, *ibid.*, 92; logs of the *Badine* and of the *Marin*, *ibid.*, 135, 216, 217; Mouffle to Pontchartrain, June 23, 1699, AC, C 13A, 1:147; Dunn, *Spanish and French Rivalry*, 187.

<sup>30</sup> Chasteaumont to Pontchartrain, June 23, 1699, Margry, IV, 109.

<sup>31</sup> Dunn, *op. cit.*, 187. Cf. Chasteaumont to Pontchartrain, June 23, 1699, Margry, IV, 108-109; Mouffle to *id.*, June 23, 1699, AC, C 13A, 1:150.

<sup>32</sup> From the journal of Sigüenza y Góngora it appears that these islands, "Cayos de San Diego," as well as others, had been named at the time of the previous maritime expeditions, and that they were entered on the map—probably made by Barroto—which Sigüenza had with him. The "Cayos de San Diego" were the string of islands and islets from present-day Petit Bois Island to Isle au Pied; cf. Mouffle to [Pontchartrain], June 23, 1699, AC, C 13A, 1:151. The map referred to in this letter is entitled "Plan de la coste de la Floride depuis le Cap S<sup>t</sup> Blanc jusques aux Isles S<sup>t</sup> Diegue," and is among the papers of Pierre Arnoul in BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 21399:377. Two variants of this map which were made by Ste. Marie, a garde-marine who took part in the 1698-1699 expedition to the Gulf, Perinet to Pontchartrain, May 4, 1700, ASH, 111-1: no. 20, are in ASH, 138-6-2 and 3.

<sup>33</sup> Chasteaumont to Pontchartrain, June 23, 1699, Margry, IV, 110.

<sup>34</sup> Log of the *Badine*, *ibid.*, 159. "The Spaniards were correct in calling it *la rivièrre de la palissade*; the mouth is entirely fenced in with trunks of trees, petrified and hard as rock," R. L. Butler, ed. and transl., *Journal of Paul Du Ru*, Chicago, 1934, 4.

river which La Salle had descended, is outside the scope of this essay. The point here is that if the Mississippi had been "generally known" at that time as the Rio del Espíritu Santo of the Spanish geographers, the Spaniards from 1686 on, and the French after 1698, would certainly have referred to the Mississippi under this name. As can be seen from what has been said in this and in the previous sections, there is not one single text which identifies the Mississippi with the Rio del Espíritu Santo.

There is mention made by Iberville of a rivière du Saint-Esprit which appeared on a freak map sent to Pontchartrain in August 1699.<sup>35</sup> This map had been forwarded to La Rochelle by the minister so that Iberville might examine it. The latter, after studying it, concluded that this rivière du Saint-Esprit was probably the Apalachicola River, certainly not the Mississippi, for its mouth was between eighty and one hundred leagues east of the mouth of the Mississippi.<sup>36</sup>

The last appearance of a rivière du Saint-Esprit in the eastern part of the Gulf of Mexico is on the Delisle map of 1703, where present-day Apalachicola River is legended "Apalachicoli ou Hitanichi et R. du St. Esprit."<sup>37</sup> On the next Delisle map of the United States, which was published in 1718 by Guillaume Delisle, Claude's son, the same river is called: "Riviere des Chattaux nommee cy devant Riv. des Apalachicolis."

Similarly, the Baye du Saint-Esprit, the Bahía del Espíritu Santo, which appeared so constantly on the northern coast since the late twenties of the sixteenth century, does not appear on

<sup>35</sup> Pontchartrain to Iberville, August 19, 1699, *ibid.*, 334.

<sup>36</sup> Iberville to Pontchartrain, August 30, 1699, *ibid.*, 341-342. A copy of a similar map was apparently sent by Thoinard to Iberville. In his answer, the latter repeated what he had written to the minister, ASH, 115-10: no. 6. One of the reasons why any attention was paid to this map was because, joined to it, there was a letter saying that the English had established themselves at the mouth of this rivière du Saint-Esprit. When he arrived at Santo Domingo, in December 1699, after being told that the English had begun a colony in the "baye de Spiritu Santo" (Ducasse to Pontchartrain, October 29, 1699, Margry, IV, 357); Iberville concluded that it was "the baye de Carlos . . . between the Cape of Florida and the Apalaches." This baye de Carlos, he said, was situated thirty leagues south-southeast of the Apalache Spanish settlement, that is, south of present-day Suwannee River. "It is this river [emptying into the baye de Carlos] which the English call [rivière] du Saint Esprit," Iberville to Pontchartrain, December 19, 1699, *ibid.*, 359. The governor of Carolina asserted that Pensacola was the bay which was called Bahía del Espíritu Santo on the maps; and the Spaniards of Pensacola feared the designs of the English on "Espiritu Santo Bay, also called Ascension Bay, and Tampa by the natives," Dunn, *Spanish and French Rivalry*, 197-198.

<sup>37</sup> The reason why Claude Delisle inscribed these three names on his map of 1703 was because he was not sure which was the correct one, cf. "Questions sur la Route de Soto," in ASH, 115-10: no. 17 X.

maps made after 1700.<sup>38</sup> The reason why it was still inscribed on this map is because of a passage in a letter written by Iberville after his return from his first voyage to the Gulf. In this letter, which is based on the log of the *Badine*, he says that, leaving the ships safely at anchor off Ship Island, he "resolved to explore in launches the environs of Lago de Lodo. This is the name which the Spaniards give to what on the maps is called the baye du Saint-Esprit."<sup>39</sup>

As we have pointed out, Iberville simply misread the legend. What he calls Lago de Lodo is nothing else than the Mississippi Sound prolonged into Lake Borgne,<sup>40</sup> and from where he was it must have appeared as a bay. We should also note that he identified this Lago de Lodo with the Baye du Saint-Esprit in a letter—the only place in all his extant writings—written after his return to France, when he had old and new maps of the Gulf before him. On the old Spanish maps of the Gulf there was a Bahía del Espíritu Santo on the northern coast, but, as we have seen, it was situated 400 miles west of the Mississippi Sound; and on the new Spanish maps of the Gulf, the only bay that was so named was Matagorda Bay. The Spaniards could not have called Lago de Lodo Baye du Saint-Esprit, for the simple reason that the first legend does not appear on their maps.

Copies of the above-mentioned letter containing this erroneous identification were made in France by people who were interested in the geography of the Gulf.<sup>41</sup> Guillaume Delisle extracted therefrom the pertinent geographical data,<sup>42</sup> and his father, as we saw, inscribed "B. du St. Esprit" to represent Breton Sound on his map of 1700. But his father had misgivings

<sup>38</sup> The Bahía del Espíritu Santo of the northern Gulf Coast appears on maps made after 1700, when the draughtsman or the engraver used a model dating back to the days of the conquista; or when they faithfully copied that of Delisle, as in the case of the map of America issued at Amsterdam in 1708; most of those who copied the Delisle map of 1700, however, omitted all mention of a Bahía del Espíritu Santo on the northern coast.

<sup>39</sup> Iberville to Pontchartrain, June 29, 1699, Margry, IV, 118.

<sup>40</sup> The following passages make the identification certain, Iberville to Pontchartrain, June 29, 1699, Margry, IV, 123, and Claude Delisle's notes entitled "Route de la Riv. d'Iberville [Manchac] au fort des Bilocchi [Ocean Springs, Mississippi] et du fort à cette Riv.," in ASH, 115-10: no. 17 Z.

<sup>41</sup> There is a copy among the papers of Father Léonard de Ste. Catherine de Sienné, BN, Mss. fr., 9097:45-48; and another in the Jesuit Archives of the Province of France, Fonds Brotier 165, Canada II. The same letter, with slight variants, was sent the following day, June 30, to an anonymous addressee; it is found today among the Bernou papers, BN, Clairambault, 1016:514-517v. The passage discussed in the text is the same in all these letters.

<sup>42</sup> "Extrait d'une lettre de la Rochelle du 2 [i. e., 29] juin 1699, de M<sup>r</sup> d'Iberville touchant la R. de Mississipi," ASH, 115-10: no. 6.

with regard to this legend. In order to clarify obscure points, Claude Delisle drew up a list of questions "to be put to M. d'Iberville." Among these questions are the following: "What is Lago de Lodo? Is it Lake Pontchartrain?<sup>43</sup> Does it include St. Louis and Biloxi bays? Is its entrance very far from the sea? Is it what the other maps call baye du St. Esprit?"<sup>44</sup> Peculiarly enough, Iberville did not answer these questions nor those which pertained to his first voyage. Yet Claude Delisle himself could have found answers to some of them by merely consulting Iberville's logs which he or Guillaume had copied. However that may be, Delisle had made up his mind about this "B. du St. Esprit" on the northern coast before he met Iberville in person, August 2, 1703,<sup>45</sup> for on his map which had been on the market four months previous to that date, and indeed on all the drafts of this map from 1701 on, there is no trace of a Baye du Saint-Esprit on the northern coast of the Gulf. The only bay of that name is on the west coast of the Florida peninsula corresponding to Tampa Bay which had been christened Bahía del Espíritu Santo when De Soto landed there in 1539.

## X

The aim of all historical studies is—or should be—to reach certitude. In the present case, we are certain that the Mississippi was not the Rio del Espíritu Santo of the Spanish geographers. The next step should be to determine the identity of this famous river, which begins to appear on maps made in the twenties of the sixteenth century. With the documentation now available this second step is impossible.

We know that it must be a river which empties into one of three bays on the northern coast: Mobile Bay, Lake Sabine, or Galveston Bay. The first one, for reasons given in a preceding section, is the most unlikely of the three; Lake Sabine is closer than is Mobile Bay to the position of the Bahía del Espíritu Santo on the northern coast line, but its shape does not correspond to that of the Bahía del Espíritu Santo as shown on the

<sup>43</sup> On an anonymous map, ASH, 138bis-1-5, showing the Gulf Coast from Cape San Blas to Matagorda Bay and the course of the Mississippi to the Illinois River, there are several interpolations by a different hand from that of the author of the map. For instance, the legend "Lac de pontchartrain" of the original is crossed out and is replaced by "baye du S. Esprit." Whoever made this change clearly wished "to harmonize" the nomenclature with that on old maps of the Gulf; and one of his insertions giving the farthest point reached by Iberville in 1700 shows that he was only superficially acquainted with the second voyage to the Mississippi.

<sup>44</sup> "Questions à fe. à M. d'Iberville," ASH, 115-10: no. 17 Q.

<sup>45</sup> ASH, 115-10: no. 17 Y.

early maps. There remains Galveston Bay. Its shape, as well as its position in the northwest corner of the Gulf, approximates more closely to the Bahía del Espíritu Santo than the others. If Galveston Bay is in fact the Bahía del Espíritu Santo, the Rio del Espíritu Santo would be the Trinity River.

To say, as De Villiers does, that the "true Bahía del Espíritu Santo was unquestionably Galveston Bay," we should know whether a Bahía del Espíritu Santo of the same shape and position was represented on the Seville padrón, and supposing that it had been so represented, we should further know whether it was exactly reproduced by the makers of the maps which have come down to us. Precisely because these two points are doubtful, we cannot have more than probability for the identification of Galveston Bay with the Bahía del Espíritu Santo of these maps.

Since certainty regarding the identity of the Rio del Espíritu Santo is impossible from the evidence now available, the conclusion here indicated as a probability is not without value, but this probability does not become certainty as a result of one's subjective conviction. Probability, or even doubt, though a less pleasing result of the study of the evidence is not a less worthy one. When ignorance is inevitable there is no disgrace in admitting it. There is such a thing as learned ignorance, the true *docta ignorantia*, which is the result of a study of the possible sources of knowledge, even when they do not yield the knowledge expected from them.

In the present case we have inquired into these sources in order to ascertain the modern equivalent of a river inscribed on hundreds of maps and named Rio del Espíritu Santo; and we have come to one certain conclusion; namely, the Rio del Espíritu Santo of the Spanish geographers is *not* the Mississippi. To some this negative result may seem disappointing; it is, however, the only conclusion justified by the evidence.

A more satisfactory result of the examination of the documentation, although only a by-product, is a better knowledge of the historical cartography of the Gulf Coast and of that part of Spanish Florida lying west of the eighty-fourth meridian.

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Institute of Jesuit History



## DOCUMENT

### The Voyage of Louis Jolliet to Hudson Bay in 1679

The document herewith printed *in extenso*, for the first time, forms the basis of one chapter of a book entitled "Three Voyages of Jolliet," the publication of which has been delayed owing to present-day conditions.<sup>1</sup>

By way of introduction we shall recount the voyages of discovery and exploration of Hudson Bay by the English and the French. The present treatment is not meant to be exhaustive, but only to bring out those points which serve to explain the antecedents of the struggle between France and England for the possession of the Mediterranean of North America. This struggle was preceded by a diplomatic debate, wherein each side tried to prove priority of discovery; but there was too much at stake to expect a solution from an exchange of notes by envoys, ambassadors, or plenipotentiaries. We are not concerned with the war which inevitably followed nor even with the period after 1679. We have made use of documents written after this date only insofar as they refer to events which took place previously.

This voyage of Jolliet, in contradistinction to that of 1673, was not one of discovery. As far as one can judge from his map and from his report, he seems to have gone over much of the same route taken seven years earlier by Paul Denis, Sieur de Saint-Simon, another Frenchman, and Father Albanel.<sup>2</sup> This latter was the fourth attempt made by the French to reach Hudson Bay. After his return to Quebec, Father Albanel wrote toward the end of his journal:

Hitherto this journey had been deemed impossible for the French, who had already thrice attempted it, but, unable to overcome the obstacles on the way, had been forced to abandon it in despair of success. . . . It is true this journey is extremely difficult, and all that I write about

<sup>1</sup> "El Rio del Espiritu Santo," MID-AMERICA, XXV, 1943, 189.

<sup>2</sup> On this Jesuit, cf. C. de Rochemontelx, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, 3 volumes, Paris, 1895-1896, II, 373, note 1; R. G. Thwaites, ed., *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, 73 volumes, Cleveland, 1896-1901, hereinafter quoted as JR, 34:246-247; *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques*, (BRH), XXV, 1919, 111, XXXIII, 1927, 183, etc.

it is but half of what the traveler must endure. There are 200 saults or water falls, which means 200 portages. . . . There are 400 rapids. . . . I say nothing of the difficulties of the road, they must be experienced to be understood.<sup>3</sup>

The French in Canada had long speculated about this overland route to Hudson Bay. In June 1640, an Englishman—thought to be Sir Thomas Yonge or Young<sup>4</sup>—who had been brought to Quebec by Indians, related to Father Le Jeune “wonderful things about New Mexico.” For two years he had sought along the Atlantic Coast, from Virginia to the Kennebec River, for some great lake or river that would lead him to the sea which is north of Mexico. “Not having found any, I came to this country to enter the Saguenay, and penetrate if I could, with the Indians of this country, to the North Sea.” The comments of Father Le Jeune on the exploration contemplated by this Englishman are in sharp contrast with the subsequent attitude of his Jesuit brethren in Canada, and indicate that the overland journey to Hudson Bay, or, as it was then called, the Sea of the North, was looked upon as an almost superhuman feat:

This poor man would have lost fifty lives, if he had had so many, before reaching this Sea of the North by the way he described; and if he had found this sea, he would have discovered nothing new, nor found any passage to New Mexico. One need not be a great geographer to recognize this fact.<sup>5</sup>

Seven years after the discovery of Lake St. John by Father De Quen in 1647,<sup>6</sup> the Jesuits, having heard of Indian villages on the “shores of the Sea in the North,”<sup>7</sup> began to think of means of reaching these tribes; and in 1658 several possible overland routes to this North Sea were mentioned in the Relation. One of these routes was described as leading up the Saguenay to Lake Piouakouami [St. John]; sixty leagues farther was Lake Outa-

<sup>3</sup> JR, 56:212.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. G. L. Nute, *Caesars of the Wilderness*, New York, 1943, 284.

<sup>5</sup> JR, 18:234-236.

<sup>6</sup> JR, 31:251-253. Father Laure wrote in his Relation of the Saguenay, 1720 to 1730: “This river [Saguenay] which takes his rise in Lake Piéksagami, which Father de Crépéul, whose apostolic sweat watered the surrounding forests, called Lake St. John . . .,” JR, 68:28. It is an anachronism on the strength of this text to say that Father de Crépéul christened Lake St. John. The name appears for the first time in the Relation of 1651-1652, twenty years before the arrival of this missionary in Canada. “On the lake which the Indians call Piagouagami, and which we have named the Lake of Saint John . . .,” JR, 37:210. In 1652, Father de Crépéul was fourteen years old and a student in the Jesuit college of Arras.

<sup>7</sup> JR, 41:182.

kouami,<sup>8</sup> and another sixty leagues' travel from this lake would bring one to the sea.<sup>9</sup> These distances were inferences from vague data supplied by the Indians and no account was taken of the numerous rapids or portages on the way. In 1660 an Indian who had made the journey told a Jesuit, who may have been Father Druillettes, of an overland route from Hudson Bay to Tadoussac by means of "two rivers [which] flow into Lake St. John, whence the Saguenay takes its rise."<sup>10</sup>

From the wording of Father Albanel's journal quoted above, it would seem that before his voyage to Hudson Bay there had been three attempts by the French to make the journey overland. The records, however, mention three attempts in all, one by sea and only two overland. The earliest, by sea, was made by Jean Bourdon, who, according to the Relation of 1657-1658, returned to Quebec after reaching latitude 55°;<sup>11</sup> namely, the latitude of Cape Harrison on the Labrador Coast. The second voyage took place in 1661, when four Canadians under the command of Michel Le Neuf, Sieur de la Vallière, together with the Jesuit Fathers Druillettes and Dablon, went as far as Necouba (Lake Nikabau), near the summit of the St. Lawrence watershed.<sup>12</sup> Two years later, in May 1663, Guillaume Couture, who had taken part in the 1661 expedition, was given a permit by Governor d'Avaugour to take five other Frenchmen and travel with "the Indians dwelling in the north as far and as long as he will deem proper for the service of the king and the good of the commonwealth."<sup>13</sup>

None of these expeditions reached Hudson Bay; although in later years, when the French became aware of the importance of the territory adjacent to the bay as an inexhaustible supply of valuable pelts, they claimed on the strength of these three voyages that according to international law they had a right to the territory in virtue of prior discovery and of having taken possession of the bay through these three voyages.

The events that led to the diplomatic exchange of notes, memorials, and reports containing the claims and counterclaims

<sup>8</sup> According to the annotator of this passage in JR, 44:323, this was Lake Ouichtagami, the headwaters of the Peribonka River. N. M. Crouse, *Contributions of the Canadian Jesuits to the Geographical Knowledge of New France 1632-1675*, Ithaca, New York, 1924, 148-149, identifies this lake with Lake Mistassini.

<sup>9</sup> JR, 44:238-240.

<sup>10</sup> JR, 45:232.

<sup>11</sup> JR, 44:188.

<sup>12</sup> JR, 46:272.

<sup>13</sup> "Ordre de M. d'Avaugour au Sr. Couture pour aller au Nord," BRH, VII, 1901, 41.

of the two countries involved must be mentioned briefly, for in this exchange specific reference is made to the three voyages before that of Saint-Simon-Albanel as entitling the French to the Hudson Bay territory.

The Frenchman Médard Chouart *dit* des Groseilliers,<sup>14</sup> after difficulties with the authorities in Canada, went to England and thence led the English to Hudson Bay in 1668. Seeing the great number of pelts brought back from this expedition, prominent men in England determined to form a trading company, and on May 2, 1670 (O. S.), they received a charter from Charles II incorporating them under the title of "The Governor and Company of Adventurers of England tradeing into Hudsons Bay."<sup>15</sup> For four years, Chouart and his brother-in-law, Pierre Esprit Radisson, who had entered the service of the English at the same time, worked for the Hudson's Bay Company. In 1674, however, as a result of Radisson's quarrel with Charles Bayly, the governor of the bay for the Company, the two renegades went to France where their desertion was pardoned. In 1682 Radisson made the voyage from Quebec to the bay in the service of Canadian merchants, who had founded a trading company in that year under the title of "Compagnie de la Baie du Nord."<sup>16</sup> Besides seizing an enormous amount of pelts from his former employers, Radisson also brought to Quebec on his return from this voyage a ship belonging to the Hudson's Bay Company. The capture of this ship was disapproved by La Barre, the governor of New France, who returned it to its captain, Benjamin Gillam. Radisson went to Paris to enter a complaint against La Barre, and obtaining no satisfaction, crossed over to England, where he again entered the service of the Hudson's Bay Company. Sailing for Hudson Bay in May 1684, he handed over to the English at Port Nelson all the pelts which his former companions had collected there for the Canadian merchants, and persuaded these companions to take service with the Hudson's Bay Company. Then, after presenting to the Company the fort which had been built at the mouth of the Nelson River, he left for England at the beginning of September.

It was only in 1685 that the Compagnie de la Baie du Nord in Quebec learned of the new treason perpetrated by their former

<sup>14</sup> G. Frégault, "L'enfance et la jeunesse de Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville," *MID-AMERICA*, XXIII, 1941, 217, note 31.

<sup>15</sup> The charter is printed in E. E. Rich, ed., *Minutes of the Hudson's Bay Company 1671-1674*, Toronto, 1942, 131-135.

<sup>16</sup> This trading company is also known as Compagnie de la Baie du Nord, Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson, and Compagnie du Nord de Canada.

employee. Incensed at the losses sustained by Radisson's defection, the stockholders obtained leave from Denonville to send an expedition to dislodge the English.<sup>17</sup> This expedition effected the forcible expulsion of the English from all the posts on the shores of James Bay, and when the news reached England, it was the turn of the stockholders of the Hudson's Bay Company to complain. Whereupon a committee composed of French and English plenipotentiaries met to discuss the prior rights of their respective sovereigns to Hudson Bay. The "Transactions between England and France Relateing to Hudson Bay, 1687,"<sup>18</sup> contain the claims and counterclaims submitted by the English and by the French; and the main feature of these "transactions" is their remarkably economical use of truth whenever it suited the purpose of the contestants.

What interests us here is the reference made to the above-mentioned three attempts by the French to reach Hudson Bay. Among the documents presented by the Compagnie de la Baie du Nord de Canada are the following:

An act from the Registers of the Sovereign Council of Quebec, dated April 26, 1656, signed Peuvret, secretary of the said Council, wherein it is proved that the man called Jean Bourdon, commanding a ship of the said company [the One Hundred Associates], followed the whole length of the northern coast of Canada, entered the said [Hudson] bay and took anew possession of it.<sup>19</sup>

The certificates of the Sieur de la Vallière, officer, and of Father Dablon, missionary, proving that in 1661, Indians [living on the shores] of the Baye du Nord de Canada [Hudson Bay], came to Quebec for the express purpose of confirming their desire of continuing to live under French rule, and of asking for a missionary. The said Father Dablon was sent overland with the said Sieur de la Vallière and five soldiers.

A commission of the Sieur d'Avaugour, then governor of New France, dated May 10, 1663, ordering and permitting the Sieur Couture to go with five men to the foot of the Baye du Nord de Canada, to accompany and help the Indians who had once more come to Quebec to ask the governor for assistance. To this commission is attached a certificate of the said Couture, saying that he made the journey in

<sup>17</sup> I. Caron, *Journal de l'expédition du Chevalier de Troyes à la Baie d'Hudson, en 1686*, Beauceville, 1918.

<sup>18</sup> Printed in D. Brymner, ed., *Report on Canadian Archives 1883*, Ottawa, 1884, note C, 173-201.

<sup>19</sup> The earlier "prises de possession" consist in an edict of Francis I of 1540 authorizing Roberval to take possession of the country discovered by Verrazano in 1525; the letters patent of Henry IV of 1598 to the Marquis de la Roche; the acts of the Compagnie de Caen; and the letters patent of Louis XIII of 1627 to the Company of the Hundred Associates.



the year 1663, and that in the country around the foot of the said bay, he again erected a cross, and buried the arms of His Majesty, engraved on copper, between two lead sheets at the foot of a large tree.<sup>20</sup>

We must inquire into the validity of these proofs, for the possession of Hudson Bay was to be the cause of much bloodshed, which is unjustified if the English had actually taken formal possession of the bay before the French succeeded in reaching its shores.<sup>21</sup>

Nearly fifty years ago, J.-E. Roy proved that Bourdon made no voyage to Hudson Bay in 1656, and he came to the conclusion that the above-mentioned act of April 26 was a forgery.<sup>22</sup> The voyage, we know, actually took place in 1657; and when we consider the date of Bourdon's departure from Quebec, May 2, and that of his return, August 11,<sup>23</sup> it is obvious that he cannot have gone to Hudson Bay. We have, besides, the positive statement in the Relation of 1657-1658 that he did not go farther than latitude 55°, and the sworn statement of Laurent Dubocq who was wounded in a skirmish with the Eskimo. This latter statement, as we shall see, agrees in every particular with the account in the Relation just referred to and with a letter of Mother Marie de l'Incarnation. In all these accounts there is no indication whatever that Bourdon went to Hudson Bay in order to take possession of it, or that he actually did take possession of the Labrador Coast at latitude 55°.

As for the "certificates" of La Vallière and Dablon, we know from the Relation of 1659-1661 that Dablon did not go farther than Lake Nikabau; that is, he was still 300 miles southeast of Hudson Bay, in a straight line. The only evidence we have of this certificate is an extant copy purportedly signed by Dablon and

<sup>20</sup> *Report on Canadian Archives 1883*, 182.

<sup>21</sup> Just after this article was written I received a copy of *Iberville le Conquérant*, by G. Frégault, Montreal, 1944. The book was originally a doctoral thesis written under my direction. When revising it for publication, Dr. Frégault inserted a discussion of the prior rights to Hudson Bay, based on what J.-E. Roy wrote in his *Histoire de la seigneurie de Lauzon*, 5 volumes, Lévis, 1897-1904, I, 215-222. In spite of repeated efforts, I have been unable to secure this latter book. It is clear from Dr. Frégault's summary, however, that Roy's arguments are inadequate to prove the prior rights of France, especially in view of the contrary evidence set forth in this present article.

<sup>22</sup> "Jean Bourdon et la baie d'Hudson," BRH, II, 1896, 2-9, 21-23. The document is not in the first volume of the *Mémoires et Documents, Amérique*, Archives des Affaires Étrangères, as stated by Marcel, but in Volume IV, folio 474; folio 475 is a second copy of the so-called declaration of Jean Bourdon.

<sup>23</sup> C. H. Laverdière and H. R. Casgrain, eds., *Journal des Jésuites*, 1892, 209, 218.

La Vallière and dated Montreal May 3, 1662.<sup>24</sup> We do not know what was said in the original, if there ever was one, for this copy, like the copies of Jean Bourdon's declaration, is a forgery which neither Dablon nor La Vallière ever saw. Its spurious character is manifest from internal evidence. First, Dablon's name is not Louis but Claude, and La Vallière's is not Denis but Michel. Secondly, it is not true that the Indians from the shores of Hudson Bay came to Quebec in the month of May to ask the governor for a missionary to instruct them and for an officer to accompany them to their country. This can be seen by comparing these statements in the certificate with the opening paragraphs of the third chapter of the 1660-1661 Relation.<sup>25</sup> Thirdly, there is nothing in this same chapter about "planting crosses and arboring the arms of His Majesty," as stated in the certificate. Finally, Couture who was one of the five Frenchmen who took part in this expedition says nothing in his deposition about such a ceremony.

The permit given by d'Avaugour to Couture is authentic enough,<sup>26</sup> but the certificate said to be attached to it seems to be as worthless as the Bourdon declaration and the Dablon-La Vallière certificate. Some ten years ago, when I used Volume Five of the *Mémoires et Documents, Amérique, Archives des Affaires Étrangères*, wherein a copy of this Couture certificate is found, the document escaped my attention, but from the entry in Dr. Leland's *Guide*,<sup>27</sup> the same remarks must be made of it as of the

<sup>24</sup> "Nous Louis Dablon pretre Religieux de la Compagnie de Jesus, Missionnaire employé a l'instruction des nations sauvages de la Nouvelle France, et Denis de La Valiere, Lieutenant d'une Compagnie d'infanterie entretenüe pour le service de sa Ma<sup>te</sup> audit pais Certifions a tous qu'il appartient que les sauvages du costé de la Baye du Nord de Canada estant venus à Quebec au mois de juin de l'année 1661 pour demander à Monsieur le Vicomte d'Argenson gouverneur de la Nouvelle France, un missionnaire pour les instruire et un officier pour les conduire, Nous y serions allez par ordre de Mond. S<sup>r</sup> d'Argenson, accompagnez des nommez Denis Guyon, Desprez, Couture, et françois Pelletier, faisant led. voyage par terre, et estant arrivez chés lesd. Sauvages, Ils nous auroient receu fort humainement et consentj que Nous prissions possession de leur pais au nom de sa Ma<sup>te</sup>, Ce que Nous auons fait en y arborant des Croix et les armes de Sa Ma<sup>te</sup>. En foy de quoy Nous auons signé le present Certificat. Fait a Montreal le troisieme May 1662 signé Louis Dablon de la Compagnie de Jesus, Denis de la Valiere." Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Mémoires et Documents, Amérique, 5:28-28v. In the upper left-hand corner is the following note in the handwriting of a clerk: "Copie du certificat du Pere Dablon Missionnaire et du S<sup>r</sup> de la Valiere officier."

<sup>25</sup> JR, 46:248-250.

<sup>26</sup> "Collationné à l'original trouvé en liasse du greffe du Conseil Souverain de la Nouvelle France par moy Con<sup>se</sup> secretaire de Sa Majesté et greffier en chef du d. Conseil soussigné[.] Peuvret[.] Collationné à Québec ce 12e novembre 1712[.] Vaudreuil Begon."

<sup>27</sup> "1664, Mar. 1. Two copies of certificate by Pierre Couture and Jacques de la Chesnaye of their having planted a cross and buried the royal arms

Dablon-La Vallière certificate: Couture's first name was not Pierre but Guillaume, and La Chesnaye's was not Jacques but Charles. Moreover, even in 1663 La Chesnaye was one of the most prominent businessmen of Canada. In October of that year, he bought for 30,000 livres the right of collecting taxes in the territory of the "traicte de Tadoussac."<sup>28</sup> A man of such substantial means would not have been a mere companion of Couture, serving in a secondary capacity; and in 1688, when Couture mentions two of those who went with him, he refers to two men then dead, who were far less prominent than La Chesnaye. If the latter had gone to Hudson Bay in 1663, he rather than Couture would have been called in to testify, for he was at Quebec in November 1688,<sup>29</sup> and he was more interested in the Hudson Bay trade than any one in Canada.

The first mention of these three "prises de possession" seems to be in a memorial which Hector de Callières sent to Seignelay in 1685,<sup>30</sup> but no certificates are referred to. In this memorial Callières says that two expeditions went to Hudson Bay in 1663, and that both took possession of it by setting up the king's arms there. Now, we know that there was only one expedition that year, and as we shall see presently, the men who were supposed to have led the second expedition, Pierre Duquet and Jean Langlois, actually made the voyage under Couture.

More important with regard to the question of priority is the opening paragraph of the same Callières memorial. He wrote: "It is a custom established, and a right recognized among all Christian Nations, that the first who discover an unknown country not inhabited by other Europeans, and who plant in it the arms of their Prince, secure the propriety thereof to that Prince, in whose name they have taken possession of it."<sup>31</sup> Callières himself admits that the English first went to Hudson Bay with the two French renegades, Messrs. Chouart and Radisson<sup>32</sup> in

in Hudson Bay country, the better to take possession thereof," W. G. Leland, J. J. Meng, and A. Doysié, eds., *Guide to Materials for American History in the Libraries and Archives of Paris*, 2 volumes, Washington, D. C., 1932, 1943, II, 877.

<sup>28</sup> *Jugements et délibérations du Conseil Souverain de la Nouvelle France, 1663-1710*, 6 volumes, Quebec, 1885-1891, I, 19.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 253, 276.

<sup>30</sup> "Memoir of Sieur de Callières for My Lord, the Marquis of Seignelay, On the encroachments of the English on the French Colonies in America," E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the History of the State of New York* (NYCD), IX, Albany, 1855, 268.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 288.

<sup>32</sup> The reason why Radisson did not go to Hudson Bay in 1668 is given in Nute, *Caesars of the Wilderness*, 119-120.

1667 (i. e., 1668); he probably did not know that Thomas James was in the bay that now bears his name in 1632, and took possession thereof on July 1 of that year.<sup>33</sup> But in the 1680's James' book as well as that of Fox had long been known in France, as is evident from an examination of the 1650 Sanson map of North America.<sup>34</sup> The delineation of Hudson Bay on this map is merely a variant of that in *The Strange and Dangerous Voyage*, and the nomenclature of the bay is borrowed from the map in James' book and from the map in the book of Luke Fox.<sup>35</sup> That the English realized this can be seen from their answer to one of the memorials presented by the French:

There is noe intention of Establishing a Right by Maps, yet the names given in them to Places and Countrys are convincing arguments of the Propriety.

It would seeme very strange that had they some years before had any thoughts of makeing pretentions to this Colony they would have permitted ye printing Mapps at Paris (licensed by the King's authority and dedicated to the Dauphin in France) in which are seen none but English names for all that part of America.<sup>36</sup>

The reference in this passage is to the Sanson-Jaillet map of North America published at Paris in 1674,<sup>37</sup> which for all that pertains to the delineation and the nomenclature of Hudson Bay repeats the previous Sanson maps of North America, 1650, and of Canada, 1656.<sup>38</sup>

The French flatly denied that Thomas Button took possession of Hudson Bay at the mouth of the Nelson River, and that the ceremony was repeated by Luke Fox. About Fox's replanting of the cross at the mouth of the river, they blandly said that "cette Croix n'a pu estre plantée que par les François";<sup>39</sup> but they pru-

<sup>33</sup> *The Strange and Dangerous Voyage of Captaine Thomas James*, London, 1633, 112. "The copie of the Letter I left at Charleton, fastened to the Crosse the first of July, 1632." Besides this letter were also "The two Pictures which are wrapt in lead, and fastened vppermost on this Crosse, are the liuely pictures of our Soueraigne Lord and Lady, *Charles*, the first; and Queene *Mary* his wife; King and Queene of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, &c. The next vnder that, is his Maiesties Royall Armes: the lowermost is the Armes of the City of Bristoll," *ibid.*, 119.

<sup>34</sup> *Amerique Septentrionale*, Par N. Sanson d'Abbeville Geog. du Roy, Paris, 1650.

<sup>35</sup> *North-VVest Fox, or, Fox from the North-west passage*, London, 1635.

<sup>36</sup> *Report on Canadian Archives* 1883, 186.

<sup>37</sup> *Amerique Septentrionale . . . Par le S<sup>r</sup> Sanson*, Presentee a Monseigneur le Davphin Par . . . Hubert Jaillet, [Paris], 1674.

<sup>38</sup> *Le Canada, ou Nouvelle France*, Par Nicolas Sanson d'Abbeville Geographe ordinaire du Roy, Paris, 1656.

<sup>39</sup> *Report on Canadian Archives* 1883, 180.

dently refrained from saying who these Frenchmen might have been.

In 1667 [1668], we read in one of the English memorials, Zachariah Gillam ("Old Zack"), an Englishman, entered the mouth of a river which he called Rupert River, built a fort near its mouth, which he called Fort Charles, and took possession of the said river as well as of the adjacent territory. The French admitted this, but argued that the English were so little acquainted with the country that they had to be guided by Groseilliers and Radisson, and that it was "unseemly that the treason of these two men should be used as a title against the rights of the Compagnie Française."<sup>40</sup> This drew a very pointed answer from the English:

The expedition made in 1667 is alone solemn enough to establish the Right of the English, and is not the less valid for the service they reaped therein from Grosseliers and Radisson said to be French men. The Venetians might as well pretend to the English Colonies, because Cabot made the discovery and the Genoese might demand reason of Spaine for their Possessions in the Indies, because Colomb was a native of that State. There are few expeditions or Voyages, and scarce any Conquests made where there is not a mixture of Forreigners 'tis sufficient that those people were not forced but hired into the service of the English nation.<sup>41</sup>

Hence according to the principle of international law appealed to by Callières, the English and not the French had a right to Hudson Bay. The French certainly were not at the mouth of the Nelson River before Button or Fox, nor in James Bay before Thomas James, nor on the shores of James Bay before Gillam, who had taken possession of the Rupert River and of the adjacent territory fully four years before Saint-Simon reached the mouth of that river. It is astonishing that the English plenipotentiaries seem to have overlooked the Relation of 1671-1672, in which Dablon and Albanel distinctly state that all the attempts made by the French before 1672 had been unsuccessful.<sup>42</sup>

The exchange of notes between the diplomats of both countries went on from March to December of 1687, when a truce was agreed upon which was to last until January 11, 1689 (N. S.). During the interval inquiries were to be made in the

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 180.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 186.

<sup>42</sup> JR, 55:234; 56:212. Cf. also *Lettres de la Venerable Mere Marie de l'Incarnation premiere Superieure des Ursulines de la Nouvelle France*, Paris, 1681, letter lxxxix, to her son, [1671], 672.



colonies with regard to the limits of the territory which rightfully belonged to France and England. On March 8, 1688, an order from Louis XIV was sent to the governor of New France "to make the most thorough search for the titles which prove the property which the French have over those places [Hudson Bay among them], and send them by the return of the first vessels."<sup>43</sup>

These "proofs" turned out to be rather disappointing and what is found in them is altogether different from the contents of the copies of the "certificates" previously mentioned. On November 2, 1688, witnesses were called in by René Louis Chartier de Lotbinière, who had been empowered to this effect by Denonville and Champigny. One of the witnesses was Laurent Dubosc [Dubocq], aged 53, who after taking the oath, said that about thirty-one or thirty-two years ago, he embarked "with the late M. Bourdon on a bark called the *Petit Saint-Jean*" . . . the said Bourdon was leaving for the *baye du Nord* with sixteen Frenchmen and two Hurons, and he, the witness, was acting as interpreter for the Indians." From Quebec they went to Percée Island, which they left toward the middle of June, sailed past Anticosti, and proceeded along the northern bank of the St. Lawrence. "They went beyond Labrador and the whole country of the Eskimo to a place where they landed after having traveled more than one hundred leagues between icebergs and the coast." The reason for landing was that the Indians invited them to barter. The next day, however, an unprovoked attack by these Indians resulted in the killing of one of the two Hurons, and the wounding of the other and of the witness himself. The two wounded men were rescued by the other Frenchmen.

The second Huron died five days later, so that the Sieur Bourdon seeing him, the witness, incapable of serving and the two Indians dead, resolved to return and in fact came back to this town, where he, the witness, was so well taken care of that he was cured, although he still feels some effects of his wounds.<sup>45</sup>

As can be seen, there is no question even of coming near Hudson Bay, nor of taking possession of it or of the Labrador Coast where they landed. This man had every reason to remem-

<sup>43</sup> Royal instructions to Denonville, *Collection de Manuscrits . . . relatifs à la Nouvelle-France*, 4 volumes, Quebec, 1883-1885, I, 419; NYCD, I, 371. The circular letter to the governors of the English colonies is in the *Report on Canadian Archives 1883*, 200-201.

<sup>44</sup> Not the *Saint François-Xavier*, as stated in the forged document relating the mythical voyage of 1656, BRH, II, 1896, 5.

<sup>45</sup> Enquête faite par le Lieutenant général en la Prevoste de Quebec. November 2, 1688, AC, C 11A, 10:96v-97v.

ber the journey, and his testimony agrees perfectly with what is found in the Relation of 1657-1658,<sup>46</sup> and with what Marie de l'Incarnation wrote in 1671.<sup>47</sup>

Peculiarly enough, no inquiry was made about the first over-land attempt to reach Hudson Bay. Druillettes, it is true, had been dead seven years in 1688, and La Vallière was in Acadia, but Dablon who had also made the journey was then in Quebec as rector of the Jesuit college there. They probably thought it better not to call in Dablon, for he could simply have referred the examiner to the Relation of 1659-1661, wherein it is specifically stated that the expedition did not go farther than Lake Nikabau.<sup>48</sup> The first witness actually called in by Lotbinière was Couture, and his testimony leaves no room for doubt about the failure of the second as well as the third attempt. After taking the oath, Couture declared that he was eighty years of age—he was 71—and testified that

about the middle of May of the year 1663, in consequence of the order of M. d'Avaugour, then governor . . . of this country, he left this town with M<sup>e</sup> Pierre Duquet, who later became a notary and the king's attorney in this provotship, and with Jean Langlois, ship-carpenter, (both of whom died during the last year), to go to the Sea of the North in company with forty-four canoe-loads of Indians. They went up the Saguenay, crossed Lake Quinogamy, and also Lake Poucagamy or St. Jean Baptiste, which is about seventy-five leagues from the St. Lawrence in a northern direction. Near the latter lake there was a chapel and a French *habitation*. Thence they pursued their journey through Lake Necouba and the lake of the Mistacirinis arriving there on June 26. Here they were astonished to see more than one foot of snow fall in one night. From this place they went to Lake Nemisco and to the river [the Rupert] which empties into the Sea of the North. But at this point the Indians whom he had with him refused to go farther; all the more because the Indians who were in the said place, never having seen any Europeans, were suspicious of them and gave signs of their dislike, so that he [Couture] felt bound not to go farther; and after trading with them and giving them presents in view of a future alliance, he came back to Quebec. The witness added that about four years earlier [actually two], he went with Fathers Dablon and Druillettes, Jesuits, as far as the said Lake Necouba, but at that time they made no alliance with the Indians of the Sea of the North.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>46</sup> JR, 44:188.

<sup>47</sup> *Lettres de . . . Marie de l'Incarnation*, letter lxxxix, to her son, [1671], 672.

<sup>48</sup> JR, 46:288.

<sup>49</sup> Enquête faite . . . , November 2, 1688, AC, C 11A, 10:96-96v.

This declaration under oath, even though taken long after the journey, clearly shows that in 1663, when the French were nearest Hudson Bay, they were still nearly one hundred miles from the mouth of the Rupert River. It also shows that Couture did not take possession of the country in the name of the king of France, that he erected no cross, that he did not set up the arms of France nor bury any plate of copper or any other metal at the foot of a tree large or small. In fact, his commission did not call for anything of the sort; by its terms he was merely permitted to go with the Indians and to winter with them, if he could do it safely and if he judged that the commonwealth would derive some benefit therefrom.<sup>50</sup>

In all subsequent disputes between England and France with regard to the territorial limits of each in North America, the French, of course, did not produce these damaging declarations, but merely repeated with further embellishments what they had been saying since 1687.<sup>51</sup> Of the three attempts to reach Hudson Bay from Canada, that of Couture came nearest to the goal. As we saw, he makes no mention of having taken possession of the country at the time of his journey of 1663, although his testimony was taken to establish this fact. Merely to ascertain how far the explorers had gone would have been of no avail unless they could be proved to have taken possession of the country in the name of their sovereign at the farthest point of their explorations. Callières, indeed, had clearly stated this to be one of the essential conditions which secured the propriety of the country discovered to that prince in whose name possession had been taken. But even if Couture had set up the king's arms and gone through the ceremony at Lake Nemiskau in 1663, the English would nevertheless be entitled to the mouth of the Rupert River and to the adjacent territory in virtue of Gillam's taking possession of the same in 1668; for as Bernou wrote in 1685, "a prince who would be the lord of the headwaters of the Danube, would not therefor be the master of its mouth."<sup>52</sup>

In 1667, four years after the date of d'Avaugour's permit to Couture, Father Beschefer wrote from Quebec: "Next spring

<sup>50</sup> Cf. BRH, VII, 1901, 41.

<sup>51</sup> See for instance the "Memoir on the French Dominion in Canada," of 1706, in which Couture is said to have taken the latitude of the spot when he buried "His Majesty's arms engraved on copper," NYCD, IX, 784. La Potherie had this memoir, cf. *Voyages de l'Amerique* . . . , 4 volumes, Amsterdam, 1723, I, 142.

<sup>52</sup> *Reflexions sur le Memoire de M. l'Abbé de Saint Vallier*, BN, Clairambault, 1016:629.

another attempt will be made to reach the Sea of the North, notwithstanding the great difficulties that have already been experienced."<sup>53</sup> At this very time Allouez, who was then in the west, was hearing more about this Sea of the North.

The Kilistinouc [Cree] have their usual abode on the shores of the Sea of the North, and their canoes ply along a river emptying into a great bay, which we think is in all probability the one designated on the map by the name of Hutson. For those whom I have seen from that country have told me that they had known of a ship; and one of their old men declared to me that he himself had seen, at the mouth of the river of the Assinipoualac [Assiniboin], some people allied to the Kilistinouc, whose country is still farther northward.

He told me further that he had also seen a house which the Europeans had built on the mainland out of boards and pieces of wood; and that they held books in their hands, like the one he saw me holding when he told me this.<sup>54</sup>

In 1669, Father Dablon, the same missionary who had gone to Lake Nikabau in 1661, came to the Northwest as superior of the Jesuit missions there. In the early part of 1670, while at Sault Ste. Marie, he wrote a report which was later printed in the Relation of 1669-1670. Besides the various tribes depending on the mission, there are, he says, "six other nations which are either people from the Sea of the North . . . or wanderers in the country around the same Sea of the North." He then resolved to make a journey to that sea and gives two reasons for going thither. The first was to investigate means and methods best adapted to the evangelization of the nomadic tribes. "The second motive for this journey is to discover at last that Sea of the North, about which there has been so much talk already, and which has not as yet been found by land." He wished to find out whether "that sea is the bay penetrated by Hudson in the year 1612,<sup>55</sup> or some other bay"; and he also wished "to ascertain what part of the Sea of the North is nearest to us." He was also eager to learn whether this sea could be reached from Quebec

by following the northern shores [Labrador Coast], as was attempted [by Jean Bourdon] some years ago. This depends on the situation of this bay, which we here [Sault Ste. Marie] have at our backs, toward the north. If this happens to be Hudson Bay or another one farther west [Button's Bay], an easy communication [with Quebec] cannot

<sup>53</sup> JR, 50:176.

<sup>54</sup> JR, 51:56.

<sup>55</sup> Hudson sighted the open waters of the bay that bears his name, August 3, 1610.

be hoped for, since it would be necessary to double a cape [Cape Wolstenholme] lying above latitude 63°. <sup>56</sup>

We know that the other bay farther west of Button's Bay and that the cape above latitude 63° is Cape Wolstenholme, because when Dablon wrote this passage he had before him either the Sanson map of North America of 1650 or that of Canada of 1656. He himself did not make the contemplated journey to the Sea of the North; it was Albanel's voyage to Hudson Bay that solved the geographical problem which had been puzzling Dablon and others for a long time. As an introduction to Albanel's journal, Dablon wrote as follows:

The sea to the north of us is the famous bay to which Hudson gave his name; it has been stirring our Frenchmen's curiosity to discover it by land, and learn its situation with reference to ourselves, the distance from here [Quebec], and what tribes dwell on its shores. The wish to gain a knowledge of this sea increased after we learned through our Indians that very recently some ships made their appearance there, and even opened a trade with those nations, who have always been represented to us as populous and rich in peltries.

Therefore M. Talon, our intendant, deemed it his duty to neglect no means in his power to effect this discovery; and, knowing that it was His Majesty's intention to have all the tribes of Canada instructed in Christianity, he asked for one of our Fathers to open a way for our Frenchmen to that bay at the same time when he bore the Gospel thither.

Accordingly we [i. e., Father Le Mercier, Dablon's predecessor as superior of the Jesuits in New France] fixed our choice on Father Charles Albanel, veteran missionary to Tadoussac, since he had had much intercourse with the Indians who possess a knowledge of that sea and who alone are able to act as guides over those hitherto unknown ways. <sup>57</sup>

Paul Denis, Sieur de Saint-Simon, and another Frenchman also represented the government on this expedition. The re-

<sup>56</sup> JR, 54:132-136.

<sup>57</sup> JR, 56:148-150. Three months after their departure, Talon wrote to Colbert, November 2, 1671, that he had heard three times from Albanel and Saint-Simon. *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1930-1931*, (RAPQ), Quebec, 1931, 158. Cf. JR, 56:156, and *Lettres de . . . Marie de l'Incarnation*, letter lxxxix, to her son, [1671], 675. Talon learning from those letters that English vessels had wintered in the bay had no doubt that the English were encroaching upon French territory: "Comme ces terres ont esté anciennement decouvertes, premierement par les françois, j'ay donné commission aud. s<sup>r</sup> de s<sup>r</sup> simon de prendre poseession reiterée au nom de sa Majesté avec ordre d'y arborer l'escusson de france dont il est chargé et de dresser son procez verbal en la forme que je luy ay donné."



mainder of this long chapter in the Relation, fifty pages in the original, contains the journal of Father Albanel, wherein there is a damaging statement about the priority claims which the French were to advance fifteen years later.

In 1672, when Dablon wrote that Indians had reported the arrival of some ships in Hudson Bay, he was referring to news which had disturbed the officialdom of Canada in 1670. In a memoir dated November 10 of that year, Talon had written to Colbert:

From Algonkin who wintered this year at Tadoussac, I learned that two European vessels have been seen "wigwaming," as the Indians put it, quite near Hudson Bay. After considering which nation might have penetrated so far north, I can only think of the English who may have dared to attempt such a navigation over this very little known and not less dangerous route, under the guidance of one Desgrozeliers, formerly an inhabitant of Canada. I intend sending thither overland some determined man to invite the Kilistinons [Cree] who are very numerous in the vicinity of that bay, to come to us as the Ottawa do, so as to get directly from them what is brought to us by the latter. For the Ottawa acting as middlemen between the other tribes and us make us pay for the roundabout detour of three or four hundred leagues.<sup>58</sup>

The information supplied by these Indians was correct and so was Talon's surmise with regard to the nationality of the bold navigators. When Albanel arrived at the mouth of the Rupert River, the English had already spent two winters there, that of 1668-1669, and of 1670-1671.<sup>59</sup> On June 28, 1672, he wrote in his journal,

scarcely had we proceeded a quarter of a league when we encountered in a small stream on our left, a hoy of ten or twelve tons, with its rigging, carrying the English flag and a lateen sail. A musket-shot's distance thence, we entered two deserted houses. A little farther on, we found that the Indians had wintered near there, and had recently taken their departure. We pursued our course, accordingly, as far as a point of land six leagues distant from the house of the Europeans.

They were now at the mouth of the Rupert River. This was

<sup>58</sup> Talon to Colbert, November 10, 1670, RAPQ, 1931, 124. Cf. *Lettres de . . . Marie de l'Incarnation*, letter lxxxiv, to her son, August 27, 1670, 649-650, where the good nun gives the Groselliers story as it was being told in Quebec, adding that the King of England had made the French adventurer a Knight of the Order of the Garter, "que l'on dit être une dignité fort honorable."

<sup>59</sup> Nute, *op. cit.*, 117-119, 123, 134-139.

the first overland journey ever made by Frenchmen from Tadousac to the "Sea of Destiny."<sup>60</sup>

All that evening we remained there firing loud musket-shots to make ourselves heard [by the Indians whom they thought were near-by] and considering with pleasure the sea which we had so eagerly sought and this so famous Hudson Bay, of which we shall speak later.<sup>61</sup>

The houses spoken of by the missionary in his journal were the headquarters of the Hudson's Bay Company, which the English together with Chouart and Radisson had left in July of the preceding year;<sup>62</sup> and in this very month, June 1672, three ships were leaving England for the Rupert River, arriving there in October.<sup>63</sup>

In Albanel's journal, which was in print in the first months of 1673, it is clearly stated that this was the first successful journey by the French to Hudson Bay, and that when they arrived at the mouth of the Rupert River there were unmistakable signs of the English having been there. As we have seen, the reason for the inquiry of 1688 was precisely to prove that the rights of France anteceded those of England; and since the narrative of the expedition of 1671-1672 had been in print fifteen years, there would seem to be no reason for questioning those who had taken part in it. In 1688 Albanel was not available, for he was in the West that year, but Paul Denis, Sieur de Saint-Simon, was called in by Lotbinière.

In 1671, he testified, he left Quebec by order of Talon "to go to the Baye du Nord in order to set up the arms of the king there." With him were Father Albanel and a Frenchman named Sébastien Pennasca. He went up the Saguenay, crossed Lakes Quinongamy, Puagamy or St. Jean, Necouba, Mistaciriny, and Nemisco, and then

descended a great river which led him to the said bay. On the bank of the said river and quite near the said bay, he found two deserted houses, which, as he learned afterwards, had been built by the English. He did not notice that any one had spent the winter there, for the houses were in a very bad state of disrepair, having no doors nor windows, and were built of uprights and roofed with reeds. They were therefore forced to go farther along the bay toward the north to find the Indians.

<sup>60</sup> H. D. Carter, *Sea of Destiny; the Story of Hudson Bay—Our Unde-fended Backdoor*, New York, 1940.

<sup>61</sup> JR, 56:184-186.

<sup>62</sup> Nute, *op. cit.*, 138.

<sup>63</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.*, 142.

Many Indians who were found at a place called Scoutenagachy,<sup>64</sup> were told by "the said Father Albanel, who speaks their language perfectly,"<sup>65</sup> that the King of France was taking them under his protection and would defend them against the Iroquois provided they embraced the Catholic Faith. Many children were brought to be baptized,<sup>66</sup> and presents were exchanged between the Indians and the French.

Having returned to the said river he had a post set up to which a plaque of tinned iron bearing the arms of His Majesty was affixed. The return journey was along the same route as that taken coming to the bay, and on the way back he also set up the same arms in the same manner on the shore of Lake Nemisco and on that of the great Mistaciriny Lake,<sup>67</sup> for he had brought along the said three tinned iron plaques for this purpose, and at the time, he drew a procès-verbal of all this which he handed over to M. Talon on arriving at Quebec.<sup>68</sup>

Talon, as is well known, particularly insisted that explorers should take formal possession in the name of the king of France of all territories which they discovered,<sup>69</sup> because, as Callières wrote, by such acts the countries became the property of the sovereign in whose name possession was taken. In the case of Saint-Simon, however, this formality was quite useless, since, as Callières also said, in order to be valid the French should have reached the shores of Hudson Bay before the English. To say

<sup>64</sup> Miskoutenagachit in Albanel's journal, JR, 56:186; the East Main River, according to Crouse, *Geographical Contributions of the Canadian Jesuits*, 166.

<sup>65</sup> "Le Reverend Pere Albanel est parti avec eux pour porter la Foi en leur pais: Il sçait en perfection la langue Montagneze, qui est celle de ce Peuple," *Lettres de . . . Marie de l'Incarnation*, letter lxxxix, to her son, [1671], 672.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Albanel's journal, JR, 56:188 ff.

<sup>67</sup> Neither in Albanel's journal nor in the declaration of Saint-Simon is there any mention of having found the arms of Great Britain set up at the mouth of the Rupert River. Yet in January 1676 a petition of the stockholders of the Hudson's Bay Company to the king of England says that "in ye absense of y<sup>e</sup> Peticone<sup>r</sup>s ships [Albanel] pulled downe yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> Ensignes w<sup>ch</sup> were set up in Hudsons Bay," Nute, *op. cit.*, 167; this was repeated in a letter of 1684 of Sir James Hayes, *ibid.*, 153. No "prise de possession" at the mouth of the Rupert River is mentioned in Albanel's journal, but on the return journey, at "Nemiskau, nous arborâmes les armes du Roy sur la pointe de l'Isle, qui coupe ce Lac, le neufiesme de Juillet"; JR, 56:206; and on July 19, "sur les deux heures après midy je plantay les armes de nostre puissant & invincible Monarque sur cette [Minahigouskat] riviere," *ibid.*, 210.

<sup>68</sup> Enquête faite . . . , November 2, 1688, AC, C 11A, 10:98-98v.

<sup>69</sup> Talon to Louis XIV, November 10, 1670, RAPQ, 1931, 121; *id.* to *id.*, November 2, 1671, *ibid.*, 157-158, etc.; especially *id.* to Colbert, November 10, 1670, *ibid.*, 137, "Le petit procès verbal cotté D. qu'ils [MM. Dollier and Galinée] ont dressé un peu à la haste et sans luy donner toute sa forme," mentioned by Talon in this letter is in AC, C 11A, 3:56, printed in Margry, I, 166.

nothing of Button, Fox, and James, Zachariah Gillam had taken formal possession of the Rupert River and of the adjacent territory in 1668; that is, four years before Saint-Simon arrived there; and on September 1, 1670 (O. S.), Bayly had taken "formal possession of 'all the Lands and Territories' of Port Nelson 'for His Ma<sup>ty</sup>' and in token thereof, nayled up the Kings Arms in Brasse on a Small Tree there." <sup>70</sup>

Albanel arrived at Tadoussac August 1, 1672, whence he proceeded to Quebec and reported to those "who had employed me"; <sup>71</sup> namely, to Father Dablon, who had returned from the West and who had been in office as superior of the Jesuit missions in New France since the preceding July, <sup>72</sup> and to Talon who was soon to leave Canada.

One month after Albanel's return, Frontenac landed at Quebec. In a long postscript to a letter of the following year, the governor wrote:

I forgot to inform you, my Lord, that upon learning that des Groseilliers was enticing all the Indians away from us and by making them presents was attracting them to Hudson Bay, where he has an establishment, I determined to make use of the zeal of Father Albanel, a Jesuit, who wished to go and open a mission in that part of the country. He will endeavor to dissuade the Indians, with whom he has great influence, from going thither. . . .

The said Father Albanel will sound out des Groseilliers, if he encounter him, and will try to win him over to our side. <sup>73</sup>

Having left Quebec too late in 1673, the missionary was forced to spend the winter with the Indians en route, <sup>74</sup> and only reached the bay at the beginning of September 1674. <sup>75</sup> What

<sup>70</sup> Nute, *op. cit.*, 136, quoting an affidavit of Nehemiah Walker of June 14, 1687.

<sup>71</sup> JR, 56:210. A. C. Laut, *The Conquest of the Great Northwest*, 2 volumes, New York, 1908, I, 130, writes that "the date of his journal, 1672, is wrong by two years." The date of Albanel's journal of his first voyage, 1671-1672, is quite correct; no journal of the second voyage, 1673-1674, if one was written, JR, 61:150-152, has come down to us. It is clear that the above-mentioned author was unaware of the two voyages of Albanel to Hudson Bay.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. "Claude Dablon, S. J. (1619-1697)," MID-AMERICA, XXVI, 1944, 100.

<sup>73</sup> Frontenac to Colbert, November 13, 1673, RAPQ, 1927, 50.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. the journal of Father de Crépéul, JR, 59:34-38; and the letter of Dablon to Pinette, October 24, 1674, *ibid.*, 64.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. John Oldmixon, "The History of Hudson's-Bay," in *The British Empire in America*, London, 1708, 382-412, reprinted by J. B. Tyrrell, ed., in *Documents Relating to the Early History of Hudson Bay*, Toronto, 1931, 10, 393. "On the 30th of August [O. S.] a canoo arriv'd at Rupert's River, with a Missionary Jesuit, a Frenchman born of English Parents." There is no authority for the last clause.

happened is well known: Bayly<sup>76</sup> shipped him to England the following year.<sup>77</sup>

For the next seven years, writes Tyrrell, we know very little about the movements of the English traders in the bay, but we are assured by a memorial prepared by the Hudson's Bay Company in 1687 that it had had undisturbed possession of its trading-posts on the bay up to 1682. In this time, in addition to the trading-post on the Rupert river, trading-posts had also been built on the Moose and Albany rivers.<sup>78</sup>

It is during the interval spoken of by Tyrrell that Jolliet went to Hudson Bay. The document printed below is—or was—in the Archives du Services Hydrographique, fifth *carton* (box or portfolio), and is the fourth, but numbered *pièce* 3, of "six documents relative to Hudson Bay and to attempts made to discover the northwest passage to the South Sea" (ASH, 5: no. 4). In the upper left-hand corner of the first page a few cancelled words are illegible; and just below, in pencil, are the words: "Chercher la Carte." This map is referred to by the clerk who endorsed the document.<sup>79</sup> In the upper right-hand corner is a note: "He [Jolliet] found the English established there [at the mouth of the Rupert River. He speaks of] the manner in which he was received and of their settlements."

After giving one of the several routes from Lake St. John to Rupert Bay which Jolliet may have taken, Gagnon goes on to say: "We shall now let M. Margry speak. He seems to have had in his hands the journal, now no longer to be found, which Jolliet kept during his exploration of 1679."<sup>80</sup> All that Margry saw is the document published below. It is a report written by the explorer in Quebec, who made use of his field notes as a basis. As

<sup>76</sup> On Charles Bayly, cf. Rich, *Minutes of the Hudson's Bay Company*, li-liv, and Appendix G, 209-213.

<sup>77</sup> Oldmixon in Tyrrell, *op. cit.*, 393-395; Rich, *op. cit.*, 212; Nute, *op. cit.*, 152-153.

<sup>78</sup> Tyrrell, *Documents Relating to the Early History of Hudson Bay*, 10.

<sup>79</sup> "Envoyé par M. de Frontenac le 8. no. 1679. avec la Carte de lad. Baye." I have not seen this letter of Frontenac which is in ASH, 111-1: no. 5. In a document entitled "Memoire sur la domination des françois en Canada jusqu'en 1687," containing summaries and extracts from letters written by the governors and intendants of New France since 1669, it is said that, among other enclosures, Frontenac sent with his letters of November 6 and November 8, 1679: "la relation et la carte du voyage que le Sr Jolliet a fait a la baye d'udson, et que les fermiers du Canada luy ont demandé; cette relation est datée du 27 octobre 1679 et signée Jolliet"; AC, C 11A, 9:281v. A copy of the whole document made in 1706 is translated in NYCD, IX, 781-803, the pertinent passage will be found on page 795.

<sup>80</sup> E. Gagnon, *Louis Jolliet, découvreur du Mississipi et du pays des Illinois, premier seigneur de l'Île d'Anticosti*, Montreal, 1913<sup>2</sup>, 218.



is expressly stated in the title it was abridged by some official, and as we learn from a note at the end of the document, it was sent to Paris by Frontenac together with a map of Hudson Bay on November 8, 1679. In the third installment of his study on Jolliet, Margry "edited" this report, further abridged it, and, as was his wont, inserted in the text comments of his own which, except for their silliness, are indistinguishable from the original report.<sup>61</sup>

The map mentioned above is the earliest extant autograph map of Jolliet.<sup>62</sup> Even with the help of this cartographical docu-

<sup>61</sup> P. Margry, "Louis Joliet," *Revue Canadienne*, VIII, 1871, 930-942; IX, 1872, 61-72, 121-138, 205-219. The reader may compare Margry's version, IX, 124, of Jolliet's meeting with the English and the same occurrence as narrated in the document published herewith.

<sup>62</sup> To list accurately Jolliet's maps of Hudson Bay is not easy, because, owing to present-day world conditions, the originals are inaccessible. As will be seen titles, press-marks, and measurements vary greatly, although it is question of the same map.

The map of 1679 has no title, but in the lower left-hand corner is the following legend transcribed as it is on the facsimile published by Pinart, and in Harris, *Notes*, 197, no. 207; the words italicized bring out the differences.

Pinart

Cette carte montre le chemin que  
Louis Jolliet a fait // depuis Tadous-  
sac jusqu'à la mer du Nord, dans  
la // Baye D'hudson; et marque la  
vraye situation // de la Baye et  
du d'estroit. ce qui est marqué de  
rouge // est le chemin par ou il  
a esté. // fait à Quebec en Can-  
ada // le 8<sup>me</sup>. novembre 1679. // L.  
Jolliet. //

Harris

Cette carte montre le chemin que  
Louis Jolliet a fait // depuis Tadous-  
sac jusqu'à la Mer du Nord, dans  
// la Baye de Hudson, et marque la  
vraye situation de la Baye et du  
Détroit // Ce qui est marqué par  
des points est le chemin par ou //  
il a esté // fait à Quebec en Can-  
ada // le 8<sup>me</sup>. novembre 1679. L.  
Jolliet. //

The original which is in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Cartes, Vol. 388 (153), is reproduced in A.-L. Pinart, *Recueil de Cartes, Plans et Vues relatifs aux États-Unis et au Canada* . . . , Paris, 1893, pl. 23. The cuttings in G. Marcel, *Cartographie de la Nouvelle France, Supplément à l'ouvrage de M. Harris*, Paris, 1885, 9, no. 10, are identical with those of the facsimile in Pinart, but Marcel modernized the wording of the legend thus: the initial of tadoussac, of hudson, and of fait, is capitalized; the two prepositions and the adverb are accented. The original is said to be in the Dépôt des Cartes, Bibliothèque Nationale, Pièce 179 du Recueil Baudrand, tome VI, Vol. 388. As can be seen, the reference is the same as that given by Pinart except for the number of the map, 179 instead of 153. In 1892, however, when Marcel published his *Catalogue des documents géographiques exposés à la Section des Cartes et Plans de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 23, no. 169, he listed this map under the same number, 153, as Pinart in the *Recueil* of 1893. The facsimile in Pinart measures, outer frame, 740x483 mm.; inner frame, 710x453 mm.; while Marcel both in *Cartographie* and in *Catalogue*, gives 770x520 mm., and what is apparently the same map, the title is incomplete, with the recent call-number, Ge. C. C. 1275, listed in Leland, *Guide to Materials for American History*, I, 225, is said to measure 560x345 mm. The differences between the measurements of the Pinart facsimile and those given by Marcel are probably due to the fact that the latter measured the whole sheet instead of the map itself; but unless there is a misprint in Leland, I cannot account for the differences between his and the other two sets of measurements.

After the entry in his *Cartographie*, 10, Marcel adds in note: "A tracing

ment, we cannot be sure of the route which he followed in his voyage to Hudson Bay. As we observed in the previous footnote, the inscription in the lower right-hand corner reads: "What is marked in red is the route which he followed"; but in the Pinart black and white facsimile, the red line cannot be made out, and present-day conditions preclude all access to the original.

There were several routes from Lake St. John to Lake Mistassini, any one of which Jolliet may have taken, and he may have

of this map made by d'Anville differs very little from no. 207 of M. H. Harrisse, and is in the [Archives des] A[ffaires] E[trangères], D[épôt] G[éographique], no. 8665." I did not see this d'Anville tracing, which, together with the rest of his collection was transferred to the Bibliothèque Nationale in 1924, and listed as Ge. DD. 2987. No. 8665. This tracing is also listed, no. 7124, in an eighteenth-century manuscript in the Library of Congress, "Inventaire de la Collection de Cartes de M. d'Anville," under the title: "Carte huilée du chemin que L. Jolliet a fait depuis Tadoussac jusqu'à la Mer du Nord dans la Baye d'Hudson &c."

The title of the map listed by Harrisse, *Notes pour servir à l'histoire*, . . ., Paris, 1872, 197, no. 207, and referred to by Marcel is given above. The archival number is ASH, 123-8-1<sup>1</sup>; the map measures 700x480 mm. In view of the important variant in the title, and in view of the fact that this map is found in a different repository, I conclude that two maps, quite similar, illustrating the voyage of Jolliet to Hudson Bay were sent to Paris in 1679. Whether that in ASH is in the handwriting of Jolliet I cannot say, for I have not seen the original or a photograph of it, but that in the Bibliothèque Nationale reproduced by Pinart is undoubtedly an autograph Jolliet map. This conclusion seems confirmed by the following consideration. As we have seen, the map reproduced by Pinart was originally in the Baudrand Collection. Michel Baudrand, Eusèbe Renaudot, and Claude Bernou pooled their geographical notes, their sketches and maps. On June 27, 1683, Bernou writing from Rome to Renaudot told the latter to warn Coronelli, who was then finishing his globe, not to trust the maps of North America and Hudson Bay by Sanson, "because they are worthless"; instead, he recommended the map "which I helped to draw"; (Cf. J. Delanglez, *Hennepin's Description of Louisiana*, Chicago, 1941, 111-119) and "that which Jolliet drew of his voyage from Tadoussac to Hudson Bay." BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:19. It is very likely Bernou who communicated a copy of this Jolliet map to Claude Delisle. Cf. J. Delanglez, "The Sources of the Delisle Map of America, 1703," *MID-AMERICA*, XXV, 1943, 287-288.

Harrisse, *op. cit.*, 197, no. 207, added the following note to the entry of the map of 1679: "A duplicate of this map is in the same portfolio [ASH, 123-8-1<sup>2</sup>], but measures 750x500 mm." Marcel, *Cartographie*, 14, no. 15, says that Harrisse mistakenly speaks of the ASH, 123-8-1<sup>2</sup> map as a duplicate, but says nothing of the difference between his measurements, 650x420 mm., and those of Harrisse; the latter's correspond exactly with those written on the photograph of this map in the Karpinski Series of Reproductions. Strictly speaking, the later map is not a duplicate of the earlier one; however, it is also an autograph Jolliet map made in 1684 on a draft of that of 1679. This second map is likewise without title, but in the upper right-hand corner is the following dedication: A Monseigneur // Monseigneur de la Barre Gouverneur // et Lieutenant General pour le Roy en toute // l'estendue de la Nouvelle France. // The clausula, the signature and the date are in the lower right-hand corner: Par son tres humble et tres // obeissant et tres fidelle serviteur // et suiet // Jolliet, // . 1684. // This 1684 map is also one of the sources used by Claude Delisle for his map of 1703, *MID-AMERICA*, XXV, 1943, 287. The map was sent by La Barre to Seignelay, November 14, 1684, *Collection de Manuscrits . . . relatifs à la Nouvelle-France*, I, 332.

gone up one way and come back by another route. From the north, Lake St. John receives

the waters of three rivers—the Peribonka, the Mistassini and the Chamouchouan [Ashwapmuchuan on some maps], the mouths of the last two being within a few miles of each other. It is well to note, since it forms the principal route from Lake St. John to Lake Mistassini, that the Chamouchouan is made by the junction of two streams, the Chief [*alias* Rivière du Chef] (and its continuation the Sapin Croche) that rises in File Axe [or Fileaxe] Lake near Lake Mistassini, and the Chebogich [Chibougich on some maps] whose continuation, the Nikaubau, rises in Lake Nikaubau. The two branches join just above Chaudière Falls at the forty-ninth parallel. Lake Nikaubau is located south of Lake Obatagamou, which . . . is one of the chain emptying into Lake Mistassini. . . .

By ascending the Chamouchouan and the Chegobich one reaches Lake Nikaubau on the divide. Crossing the divide at this point and passing down through Lakes Obatagamou, Chibougamou and Wahwanichi [also Wakanichi] one reaches Mistassini; in fact, this route was chosen by Fathers Dablon and Albanel as less difficult than the shorter one by way of the Chief River and File Axe Lake.<sup>83</sup>

This brief and clear description of the hydrography of the region between Lake St. John and Lake Mistassini enables one to identify with certainty two of the three rivers shown on Jolliet's map of 1679, but for reasons already given, it is impossible to determine which of these rivers he followed. There is no difficulty in identifying the Peribonka; for the river is legended on the map "R. periboca" near its mouth, and "R. necouba" is the Ashwapmuchuan. The "R. Kakiga8sipi" probably represents the Mistassini River with its tributary the Washimeska whose headwaters are a short distance from the Nestawkanow, the eastern branch of the Chief River. On leaving Lake Mistassini—oriented east-west on his map instead of northeast-southwest—Jolliet followed the Marten River down to where this tributary of the Rupert joins the main stream, about fifteen miles east of Lake Nemiskau.

A dotted line originating at Lake Nipissing follows the Ottawa, but the course of this river is not shown on the map; another dotted line begins at Fort Frontenac and meets that coming from Lake Nipissing at Montreal. These two routes are called "Chemin des Outaouas," and "chemin du fort frontenac," respectively. From Montreal the course of the St. Lawrence

<sup>83</sup> Crouse, *Contributions of the Canadian Jesuits*, 145-146, 149.

through Three Rivers to Quebec is represented by a dotted line; thereafter the river itself appears on the map.

Five years later Jolliet redrew this map of 1679 and dedicated it to Governor Lefebvre de la Barre. In this second draft, however, he began drawing the northern part too low, so that at the latitude of Quebec, he was at the end of his paper. In the lower left-hand corner he wrote: "Sault Ste Marie par 46," which is the latitude of this mission on the 1679 map. The frame of the 1684 map, drawn after the map was finished, cuts across the island [Baffin] bounded by David [Davis] and Hudson Straits. On the earlier map, Baffin is represented as two islands separated by a "destroit qui est toujours plein de glace." This may have been intended to indicate Frobisher Bay or Cumberland Gulf, the northernmost part of which reaches the Arctic Circle. An unnamed bay, 125 miles deep, is shown on the map of 1684, and probably takes the place of the "strait which is always full of ice" mentioned on the map of 1679.

On both maps the Labrador Coast, from the Strait of Belle Isle to Cape Wolstenholme at latitude 63° is represented as a line running from the southeast to the northwest; the coast is unindented, and there is no indication of Ungava Bay; and on both maps there is a difference varying from one to one and a half degrees between the position of identifiable landmarks and their true latitude. With regard to the legends inscribed on the two maps, the later one has more names along the banks of the St. Lawrence, while less rivers are shown or named than on the earlier one. For instance he does not legend the Peribonka nor the Mistassini nor the Ashwapmichuan.

Three routes to Hudson Bay not shown on the map of 1679 are on that of 1684. Two "chemins des sauages a la baye" are indicated by dotted lines from "lac limibogon [Nipigon] par 51°"; the southern trail leads to the "R. Kechitchioüen [Albany River]," the northern one to the "R. Penatchichoüen [Attawapiskat River?]." The third, "chemin des francois et des sauages a la baye," is from the "R. Matoüan [upper course of the Ottawa]" to the "R. Monsonis [Moose River]." To indicate that the English had trading posts at the mouth of these three rivers, there is a square legended "anglois."

Attention may be called to two descriptive legends. On the earlier map, south of Lake Mistassini near the discharge of Lake Albanel, Jolliet drew a square and wrote "francois"; inside the larger lake he inscribed the following: "Lac timigaming ou iay



basti une maison." On the later map the wording of this inscription is simply: "maison Jolliet." The second descriptive legend regards Anticosti Island. When he made the map of 1679, Jolliet had not yet been granted the Anticosti concession, but in 1684 he had been living there with his family for the past four summers. He called attention to his new domicile by writing across the island "maison Jolliet." In view of these inscriptions, it is not improbable that in 1684 Jolliet was still using the building on Lake Mistassini as a warehouse or that he had agents there.

JEAN DELANGLEZ

### DOCUMENT

Abregé du voyage de Louis Jolliet en 1679 jusqu'a la Mer du Nord dans une grande Ance appelée Baye D'hudson, ou les Anglois font presentement le plus beau Commerce du Canada.

Ce fut le 13<sup>e</sup> de May de l'année 1679 que je partis de Quebec avec huit hommes<sup>1</sup> pour visiter toutes les Riuieres et tous les Lacs qui dependent de la traite de Tadoussac,<sup>2</sup> mon entrée dans les terres fut par le Saguenay qui vient proche d'un grand Lac nomme Timagaming [Mistassini] qui est la source de la Riuere de Nemisco [Rupert River] qui se Decharge dans la Baye du Nord, sur laquelle Je fis toute ma route jusqu'a la Mer.

Après auoir fait 343 lieües en destours, quoiqu'il n'y en ayt que 160 en droite ligne, et 122 portages, tant grands que petits Nous trouuâmes au pied d'Un Cap de terre glaise, ou les raports de la marée, Nous firent juger que Nous etions proche de la Baye doublant le Cap, Nous la decourismes tout d'un coup et Nous

<sup>1</sup> "Dans son résumé du journal de Jolliet, M. Margry ne fait nulle mention du P. Antoine Silvy . . . D'après le 'deuxième registre' de Tadoussac, le P. Silvy aurait accompagné Jolliet 'en mai 1679, à la baie d'Hudson,'" Gagnon, *Louis Jolliet*, 225. If Silvy went with Jolliet and if Jolliet mentioned the missionary in his report, it is the abridger who omitted his name, just as the author of a version of the discovery of the Mississippi, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7485:176-177v, a garbled compilation which has been repeatedly attributed to Jolliet, omitted all mention of Marquette. I have not been able to examine the "deuxième registre" referred to by Gagnon, but from a study of this document by A. E. Gosselin, it does not appear that Father Silvy went with Jolliet as far as Hudson Bay. Gosselin writes: "On le [Silvy] trouve, soit à Chicoutimi, soit au lac Saint-Jean. Au mois de mai 1679, il est, pour nous servir des expressions même du registre: *ad norticum*, et encore: à Saint-Xavier où il établit la mission de Némiskau." *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, series 3, XI, 1917, sect. 1, 120, "A Chicoutimi et au Lac St.-Jean à la fin du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Notes tirées d'un ancien registre."

<sup>2</sup> The meaning and the boundaries of the "traite de Tadoussac" are given by Gagnon, *op. cit.*, 211.



eusmes le plaisir pendant un beau Calme, de Considerer la Mer et le fort des Anglois qui n'estoient qu'a une lieue de nous.<sup>3</sup>

Le Courant Nous mena insensiblement deuant le fort ou ne voyant personne Nous tirasmes un coup de fuzil, [*verso*] afin de faire sortir quelqu'un, ne voulant pas les surprendre en débarquant sans estre veus Incontinent on Nous repondit, non du fort, car il ny auoit personne, mais de l'autre bord, de la Riuere ou estoient trois Anglois a la chasse et comme leur bateau s'estoit echoué, la marée estant basse, et qu'ils nous prenoient pour des estrangers qui descendoient en traite Ils nous crierent en sauage d'aller a eux pour les passer au Fort, La Riuere estoit fort large et nous etions trop eloignez pour estre reconnus françois Nous allions deuers eux, et eux venoient a Nous sur les battures, lorsque le premier qui deuançoient les autres d'enuiron trois cens pas s'aperceut que nous n'etions pas de leurs gens, il n'hésita pas a retourner sur ses pas rejoindre les autres et plus ie luy disois de venir et de n'auoir point de peur, et plus il se pressoit Les voyant tous trois arreztez a nous regarder, Nous débarquames, et je leur parlay françois celui qui l'entendoit un peu nous repondit, demanda qui nous etions, luy ayant crié que j'estois françois et que mon nom estoit Jolliet, Il s'en vint a Nous, Nous leur fismes toutes sortes de ciuilitéz, qui ne manquerent pas de leur costé, Le premier s'embarqua avec nous et les deux autres se mirent dans un Canot sauage que nous auions trouué six lieues plus hault, qui [*recto*] redescendoit pour scauoir les nouuelles que nous n'auions pas voulu luy dire, et qui nous auoient joint pendant ce Dialogue, qui luy donna sujet de rire, et de se moquer de leur peu de hardiesse et d'experience.

Voiant qu'il n'entendoit pas le françois, je luy parlay latin il me dit quil le scauoit mieux que nostre langue<sup>4</sup> Pour lors nous neumes pas de peine a Nous faire connoistre nos pensees l'un l'autre Il me monstra la peninsule ou estoit leur Gouverneur<sup>5</sup> trois

<sup>3</sup> On the maps of 1679 and 1684, this fort is situated on the south bank of the Rupert River, near present-day Rupert House.

<sup>4</sup> The identity of this English backwoodsman who knew Latin well enough to carry a conversation in that language has not been ascertained. Cf. Gagnon's comments in *Louis Jolliet*, 220.

<sup>5</sup> This governor was Charles Bayly. Two centuries ago, J. Robson had difficulties with regard to the succession of the Hudson Bay governors, cf. *An Account of six years residence in Hudson's Bay, 1733-1736, 1744-1747*, London, 1752, Appendix I, 7. These difficulties have been recently cleared up. Thus in *The Conquest of the Great Northwest*, 130, Laut quoted from a letter of Morgan Lodge to Sir Joseph Williamson dated September 24, 1675 (O. S.), but left out two lines giving the explanation; and the "Laut Transcripts" in the E. E. Ayer Collection, Newberry Library, Chicago are of little help, for these "transcripts" from the Hudson's Bay

ou quatre lieues au large, avec un Nauire de Douze pieces de Canon, et deux petites barques, Il nous menerent au fort et nous receurent tres bien, Nous donnant tout ce qu'ils auoient de meilleur a Manger de ce quil leur restoit, Car le vaisseau n'etoit pas encore arriué de Londres dans lequel on enuoie tous les ans ce qui leur est necessaire pour leur prouisions.

Mon dessein etoit de partir le lendemain sans attendre le Gouverneur, mais ils me firent tant d'instance pour sejourner que je resolu de demeurer, aussitost qu'il fut jour un Canot sauvage partit pour l'aller auertir et je luy enuoie une lettre qui contenoit ce qui suit

Monsieur

Aiant été employé par Monseigneur le Comte Defrontenac Gouverneur de tout le Canada pour visiter les Nations et les terres du domaine du Roy [*verso*] en ce pais,<sup>6</sup> Je suis descendu jusqu'au lac de Nemisco pour retourner par les trois Riuieres<sup>7</sup> estant a ce lac et n'ayant plus de viures, et ne trouuant rien a tuer, faisant d'ailleurs reflexion que plusieurs françois ces années dernieres etoient reuenus de chez vous,<sup>8</sup> avec toute sorte de Louange de la bonne reception que vous leur auiez faite,<sup>9</sup> Jay cru que vous ne me feriez pas moins de faueur qu'a eux, et qu'en vous paiant vous me donneriez un peu de Gallette et de boisson

Company papers are in reality notes jotted down haphazardly. From what A. S. Morton writes in *A History of the Canadian West to 1870-1871*, London, [1939], 78-79, it is clear that the governor who received Jolliet was Bayly, but Morton does not give the documentary proof for his statement; namely, the Morgan Lodge letter mentioned above, wherein the latter announces the return of the *Shaftesbury* from "hudson bay in the norwest . . . it seems they carryed [in 1674] A new Governor [William Lydall] for that new culleny: but he finding that affaires thare, did not pleas him: he is retorned Home Againe & Left the old governor [Bayly] thare." The following day the same writer announced the arrival of the *Prince Rupert* "Capt. Gilam Comandr. . . . I was on bord of him and he tells me that the were forced to winter there, and spend those Provisions which the should have Left there for the New Governor [Lydall] and the men thett was to stay with him for which Reason the were forced to bringe the said Governor and men home againe, and have onely Left four men [among whom was Bayly] there [Charles Fort] to Kepe Possession of the said Place," Rich, *Minutes of the Hudson's Bay Company*, 212.

<sup>6</sup> "La traite de Tadoussac" and "les terres du domaine du Roy," were one and the same thing; cf. Gagnon, *Louis Jolliet*, 211.

<sup>7</sup> Neither in the document nor in the map of 1679 is there any indication that Jolliet returned to Quebec by way of the St. Maurice, although there is on the map a rough sketch of this river. For a description of this route, cf. Crouse, *Geographical Contributions of the Canadian Jesuits*, 145.

<sup>8</sup> It is unlikely that Jolliet refers to Thomas Leclerc and Eustache Prevost, whom Bayly sent to England on the *Shaftesbury* in 1677. Cf. A. S. Morton, *A History of the Canadian West*, 79.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. the "Transactions" of 1687, *Report on Canadian Archives 1883*, 177, 178.

pour me faciliter mon retour, vos gens me font esperer que vous viendrez icy, Je ne partiray que demain, si je suis assez heureux que de vous voir, j'auray bien de la joie de vous saluer et de vous assurer que je suis

Il N'eust pas plustost receu ma lettre qu'il s'embarqua dans une barque de 15 tonneaux avec 15 hommes. Le vent luy manquant a moitié chemin, il se mit dans son batteau, accompagné de cinq matelots, je fus seul au deuant de luy le long de la Mer demy quart de lieue je le saluay de loing, un batture de sable l'empescha de débarquer vis a vis de moy, il me passa me disant Mons.<sup>r</sup> je suis a vous, Cinquante pas plus hault il eut beau aborder et vint seul vers moy pendant ce temps la quatre de ses gens estoient dans le bateau [*recto*] assis, et un estoit a terre debout tenant un fusil a la main, les saluts furent reciproques de Ciuiletez et de temoignage de bien veillance, sa premiere parole fut Mons.<sup>r</sup> soiez le bien venu, vous estes ici en pais et n'avez rien a craindre, vous y demeurerez tant qu'il vous plaira, et quand vous voudrez vous en retourner, ie vous aideray de tout ce que ie pouray pour votre voiage Il y a longtemps que jay ouy parler de vous, et je suis rauy d'auoir l'occasion de vous entretenir et de vous entendre parler de cette grande descouuerte que vous avez faite du Costé du Mexique sur la Riuiere que les Sauuages appellent Mississipi. Les Anglois font estat des Descouureurs, et me prenant par la main allons dit il puisque vous n'avez aucun dessein de Nous Nuire vous n'avez aucun sujet D'aprehender qu'il vous soit fait aucun tort Il fit signe a ses gens de poursuiure leur chemin, et Nous, nous suuismes le bord de l'eau pour aller au fort ou je receus de luy toutes les honnestetez et les Ciuiletez que l'on peut faire a une personne. Il fut bien aise d'apprendre les Nouuelles de la France et de Londres il y auoit un an que son vaisseau estoit party il l'attendoit de jour en jour,<sup>10</sup> et mesme commençoit a tarder, il aprehendoit qu'il n'eust été arrêté des glaces dans le detroit,<sup>11</sup> tout le reste du jour se passa a parler de [*verso*] toutes sortes d'affaires et il me dit Qu'ils auoient un Nauire de douze pieces de Canon pour garder les Costes, qui paroissoit a L'Ancre a une pointe au large, qu'il auoit perdu le printemps une barque de 40 tonneaux par les glaces qui descendant des terres auoient écrasé le bastiment, quil en auoit encore une de mesme grandeur,

<sup>10</sup> A ship, the *John and Alexander*, arrived shortly after the departure of Jolliet, Bayly returned on it to England, and died in London on January 16, 1680 (N. S.).

<sup>11</sup> According to Jérémie, Hudson Strait was free of ice from July 15 to October 15, "Relation du détroit et de la Baye de Hudson," in J. F. Bernard, *Recueil de Voyages au Nord*, Amsterdam, 1732, III, 306.

et une autre de 15 tonneaux avec trois batteaux Que tousces bastimens estoient pour aller en traite a toutes les Riuieres de la Baye ou les sauuages apportent leurs Castors, qu'ils auoient trois forts assez éloignez les uns des autres, et qu'ils se preparoient pour trauailler le printemps a un quatrieme<sup>12</sup> sauancant toujours de plus en plus vers L'Ouest aux embouchures des Riuieres qui viennent proche du Lac Superieur ou sont les Nations qui ont accoustumé de commercer avec Nous et qu'ils estoient en tout soixante hommes.<sup>13</sup>

A L'Esgard du Castor, il me confirma ce que j'auois appris des sauuages, qu'il en faisoit tant qu'il vouloit et sur tout depuis un an qu'il s'estoit auancé a ces autres Riuieres, Il m'ajousta qu'il y auoit encore quelque chose de meilleur, qui rendroit Cet établissement plus considerable a laduenir sans m'expliquer ce que ce pouuoit estre.

Il me demanda si je voulois me joindre a luy et [*recto*] moffrit dix mil francs une fois païées et mil liures de pension par an pour ce sujet, Je le remerciay luy disant que j'estois né sujet du Roy de France et que je ferois Gloire toute ma vie de le seruir [*N<sup>a</sup> in the margin*] avec fidelité C'estoit pour faire un établissement aux assinibouels, et decouurir plus loin qui sont des Nations que Monseigneur le Comte a fait venir depuis quatre ans. Il leur a enuoié cette année un present pour les attirer a luy et lier commerce avec Eux, Leur pais est le lieu seul des beaux Castors, et autres menues pelteries. Il ny a point de doute si on les laisse dans cette Baye qu'ils ne se rendent Maistres de tout le commerce du Canada deuant six [dix?] ans,<sup>14</sup> quelque uns de ceux qui venoient a Montreal y ont été cette année, et y doiuent

<sup>12</sup> Besides the three English trading posts mentioned above, a fourth is indicated near the mouth of the "R. panachitchiouën" on the maps of 1679 and 1684.

<sup>13</sup> "Towards Hudson Bay, . . . the English have some forts for the trading only, in which, as we are informed there are sixty men . . ." Duchesneau to Colbert, November 14, 1679, *Collection de Manuscrits . . . relatifs à la Nouvelle-France*, I, 271; translation in NYCD, IX, 137-138. Duchesneau's source of information was Jolliet, for this letter was written three weeks after the latter's return to Quebec.

<sup>14</sup> The same fear is expressed by Duchesneau in the letter just quoted. Two years later, the intendant wrote: "They [English] are still in the north, in Hudson Bay, and do great damage to our fur trade. The revenue contractors feel it. The returns of their "traite de Tadoussac" as well as those of the whole colony have fallen off, because the English entice the Ottawa to bring them their pelts. They do this damage by means of two forts, one towards Tadoussac [*i. e.*, the fort on the Rupert River], the other at Cape Henrietta Maria [Port Nelson], towards the Assinibouetz [Assinibouin]"; Duchesneau to Seignelay, November 13, 1681, *Collection de Manuscrits . . . relatifs à la Nouvelle-France*, I, 286.

retourner ce printemps Ce sont les Timiscamings,<sup>15</sup> et la bande de Routin tout le monde scait que les Outaouacs ne font point de Castor, mais le vont querir aux Nations de la Baye des Puants, ou a celles D'alentour du Lac Superieur, et par consequent il est a croire que ces dernieres se voiant tout proche des Anglois bien Establis et fournis de Marchandises, leurs Garderont leurs pelteries comme plusieurs ont Desja commencé.

Lorsqu'il plaira a sa Majesté de vouloir faire sortir les Anglois de cette baye pour estre Maistre de tout le pais et Commerce des Castors, il sera [verso] Facile d'en donner les moiens, et de les mettre en Execution.<sup>16</sup> Les forts n'ont a present que le nom de Fort. Ce sont de petits quarrez de pieux, qui renferment leurs maisons. Ils se batissent pour resister au froid, et non pas aux armes de ceux qui pouroient les attaquer par terre, dont ils ne se mefient nullement, croiant N'auoir a se fortifier que du Costé De la Mer, en gardant dans la Baye un Nauire et plusieurs barques de 30 et 40 tonneaux capables de retourner a Londres mais il sera facile quand il plaira a Sa Ma<sup>te</sup> l'ordonner de les empescher de s'establiir plus Loin sans les chasser ny sans rompre avec eux.<sup>17</sup> Après auoir esté deux jours avec luy, et auoir appris tout ce que je voulois scauoir je rembarquay dans mon Canot aiant pour viures un sac de Gallettes et un sac de farine qu'il me donna, me faisant mil excuses de ne pouuoir pas me donner autre chose, et je repris mon Chemin pour Quebec ou jarriuy le 25<sup>e</sup> octobre 1679.

L Jolliet

<sup>15</sup> The Temiscaming, a band of Algonkin, living about Timiskaming Lake, Quebec. The route from their habitat to the mouth of the Moose River was just as easy, and shorter than the route to Montreal; moreover, the English paid them two, three, and even four times more for their pelts than the French did.

<sup>16</sup> The task was to be much more difficult than Jolliet thought. It took ten years and the daring and brilliance of Iberville to expell the English from Hudson Bay, cf. Frégault, *Iberville le Conquérant*, 89-127, 177-191, 236-263. In 1713, Louis XIV returned the bay to the English.

<sup>17</sup> "The only means to prevent [the English] from succeeding in that which is so prejudicial to our trade would be to drive them out by armed force from that bay which belongs to us; or else, if this extreme measure is inadvisable, to build forts on the rivers leading into the lakes in order to stop the Indians at these points," Duchesneau to Seignelay, November 13, 1681, *Collection de Manuscrits . . . relatifs à la Nouvelle-France*, I, 286-287.



## Book Reviews

*New Viewpoints in Georgia History.* By Albert B. Saye. The University of Georgia Press, Athens, 1943. Pp. 256.

*East Florida as a British Province 1763-1784.* By Charles Loch Mowat. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1943. Pp. 237.

Dr. Saye has attempted a review of Georgia history in the light of contemporary scholarship, and he has, on the whole, succeeded in his task. He has come upon certain revisions of older interpretations which are interesting but scarcely revolutionary. They pertain mostly to the founding of the colony. Dr. Saye maintains, first, that those most actively engaged in founding the colony were members of Parliament interested in Imperial affairs as well as in philanthropy; second, that the release of debtors was only one among many of the colonizing schemes hit upon by the sponsors of the colony, and the charitable aspect of the colony was soon expanded to include not only the poor and unemployed of England, but also persecuted Protestants in foreign states; and third, that only a handful of debtors were ever released from English jails and sent to Georgia (a dozen, says Dr. Saye, would be a fair estimate); lastly, that the British government was interested primarily in the colony as a frontier defense project, and sponsored it in spite of, rather than because of, its charitable aspect.

Dr. Saye devotes a chapter apiece to the study of the genesis of Georgia, the execution of the trust, Georgia as a model royal colony, Georgia during the Revolution, the early state government of Georgia, and Georgia in the Federal Union. Throughout the later chapters he has provided a nice synthesis of recent studies in Georgia history.

Dr. Mowat in his study of Florida as a British province during the twenty-one years 1763-1784 has, unlike Dr. Saye, had the enviable experience of working in an almost virgin field. Dr. Mowat has done a painstaking, thorough, competent, and timely study of this neglected British colony. He has carefully consulted the principal bodies of documentary material, such as those in the British Public Record Office, and in the Clements Library at Ann Arbor, and has taken from them any material which is of interest to the history of East Florida as a British colony. In some places throughout his text Dr. Mowat virtually paraphrases the original documents. His study is a storehouse of information concerning the colony, and future students of colonial history will be grateful to him for it. Appended to tables of trade and shipping related to the colony, lists of Acts of the Assembly, and of

government officials, are useful. The footnotes are listed chapter by chapter at the end of the study, and comprise a virtual calendar of the documents relating to the subject. Concluding the volume, Dr. Mowat has presented an excellent bibliographical essay on the subject.

CLINTON NEWTON HOWARD

University of California, Los Angeles

(Other reviews and "Notes and Comment" are omitted from this number to curtail paper usage.)